arXiv:1204.4969v1 [math.PR] 23 Apr 2012

CHARACTERIZATION OF STATIONARY DISTRIBUTIONS OF REFLECTED DIFFUSIONS

WEINING KANG AND KAVITA RAMANAN

Abstract. Given a domain G, a reflection vector field $d(\cdot)$ on ∂G, the boundary of G, and drift and dispersion coefficients $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$, let $\mathcal{L}$ be the usual second-order elliptic operator associated with $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$. Under suitable assumptions that, in particular, ensure that the associated submartingale problem is well posed, it is shown that a probability measure π on $\overline{G}$ is a stationary distribution for the corresponding reflected diffusion if and only if $\pi(\partial G) = 0$ and

$$\int_{\bar{G}} \mathcal{L} f(x) \pi(dx) \leq 0$$

for every f in a certain class of test functions. Moreover, the assumptions are shown to be satisfied by a large class of reflected diffusions in piecewise smooth multi-dimensional domains with possibly oblique reflection.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Description of Main Results.** The main focus of this work is to provide a simple characterization of stationary distributions of a broad class of reflected diffusions. Consider a domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^J$, equipped with a vector field $d(\cdot)$ on the boundary ∂G, and drift and dispersion coefficients $b : \overline{G} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^J$ and $\sigma : \overline{G} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^J \times \mathbb{R}^N$, where $\overline{G}$ is the closure of G. A reflected diffusion associated with $(G, d(\cdot))$, $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is, roughly speaking, a continuous Markov process that behaves locally like a diffusion with state-dependent drift $b(x)$ and dispersion $\sigma(x)$, for x in G, and is instantaneously constrained to stay inside $\overline{G}$ by a pushing term that is only allowed to act when the process is on the boundary, and then only along the directions specified by the vector field $d(\cdot)$ at that point on the boundary. One approach to making this heuristic description precise is the so-called submartingale problem of Stroock and Varadhan [45], which is a generalization of the martingale problem that was introduced to characterize the law of reflected diffusions in smooth domains. A submartingale problem is said to be well posed if it has a unique solution, and this implies existence and uniqueness in law of the associated reflected diffusion. A precise formulation of the submartingale problem in multi-dimensional domains is given in Section 2. The relation of this formulation to stochastic differential equation characterizations of reflected diffusions can be found in [29].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60H10, 60J60, 60J65; Secondary: 90B15, 90B22.

Key words and phrases. Reflected diffusions, reflecting diffusions, stationary distribution, invariant distribution, submartingale problem, stochastic differential equations with reflection, basic adjoint relation, queueing networks.

The second author was partially supported by NSF grants CMMI-1059967 (formerly 0728064) and CMMI-1052750 (formerly 0928154).

For reflected diffusions in a bounded domain, the family of time-averaged occupation measures is automatically tight, and the existence of a stationary distribution can be deduced as a simple consequence. On the other hand, for reflected diffusions in unbounded domains suitable conditions on the drift and reflection vector field need to be imposed to guarantee positive recurrence (see, e.g., [1] for sufficient conditions and also [4], which shows that the issue of stability can be quite subtle in the presence of oblique reflection). In either case, when the diffusion coefficient is uniformly elliptic, uniqueness of the stationary distribution follows from standard results in ergodic theory. The focus of the present paper is on characterization of the stationary distribution.

Given continuous drift and dispersion coefficients $b : G \mapsto \mathbb{R}^J$ and $\sigma : G \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{J\times N}$, let $a : G \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{J\times J}$ be the associated diffusion coefficient given by $a(\cdot) = \sigma(\cdot)\sigma^T(\cdot)$, where $\sigma^T(x)$ denotes the transpose of the matrix $\sigma(x)$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the usual associated second-order differential operator

$$\mathcal{L}f(x) \doteq \sum_{i=1}^{J} b_i(x)\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(x)\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(x), \qquad f \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G}), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G})$ is the space of twice continuously differentiable functions on $\overline{G}$ that, along with their first and second partial derivatives, are bounded. The first main result of this paper, Theorem 1, shows that under suitable conditions (see Assumptions 1 and 2), a probability measure π on $\overline{G}$ is a stationary distribution for a reflected diffusion defined by a well posed submartingale problem if and only if π satisfies $\pi(\partial G) = 0$ and

$$\int_{\overline{G}} \mathcal{L}f(x)\, d\pi(x) \leq 0 \tag{2}$$

for all f belonging to $\mathcal{H}$, the class of test functions defined in (6). The second result, Theorem 2, shows that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied by a large class of reflected diffusions in piecewise smooth domains described in Definition 3.2, which includes a family of (possibly non-semimartingale) reflected Brownian motions (RBM) in convex polyhedral domains with piecewise constant vector fields that arise in applications. Illustrative examples of such reflected diffusions are provided in Section 4, where it is additionally shown that the conditions of Theorem 1 are also satisfied by some processes outside this class, including reflected diffusions in two-dimensional domains with cusps.

If the stationary distribution π of a reflected diffusion can be shown to have a density p that is sufficiently regular, standard arguments can be used to show that p should be the solution to a certain partial differential equation governed by the adjoint $\mathcal{L}^*$ of $\mathcal{L}$, and subject to certain oblique derivative boundary conditions. In non-smooth domains, such regularity properties are not always satisfied and, even when satisfied, are typically hard to establish *a priori*. Nevertheless, in some cases it is possible to write down the formal adjoint partial differential equation and boundary conditions and find an explicit solution to it (see, e.g., [22], [31], [34], [43]). In such situations, it would be useful to have a result that guarantees that this solution is indeed the stationary distribution of the reflected diffusion. Using Theorem 1, it is shown in Corollary 3.4 that any nonnegative integrable solution of the adjoint partial differential equation, when suitably normalized, is indeed a stationary density of the reflected diffusion.

1.2. **Motivation and Prior Work.** Our results can be viewed as a generalization of Echeverria's results [17] for diffusions in $\mathbb{R}^J$ to the case of reflected diffusions. Given sufficiently regular drift and dispersion coefficients $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$, Echeverria [17] showed that a probability measure π is a stationary distribution for the associated diffusion in $\mathbb{R}^J$ characterized by the corresponding martingale problem if and only if (2) holds with inequality replaced by equality and for test functions $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\mathbb{R}^J)$, the space of twice continuously differentiable functions on $\mathbb{R}^J$ with compact support. An extension of this result to reflected diffusions in $\mathcal{C}^2$-domains was considered by Weiss in his unpublished Ph.D. thesis [49]. However, the results of [49] do not apply to reflected diffusions in non-smooth domains in $\mathbb{R}^J$. Such reflected diffusions arise in many fields including finance [5], economics [39], communications [37] and operations research [24], and it is of interest to characterize their stationary distributions. For the particular case of reflected Brownian motion (RBMs) in convex polyhedral domains, explicit expressions for the stationary distribution have been established only in some two-dimensional examples [7], [22], [51], or when a certain skew-symmetry condition holds [52], in which case the stationary distribution has a density that is the product of its marginals. In other cases, numerical schemes have been proposed for the computation of stationary distributions (see, e.g., [10] and [42]). The characterization of the stationary distribution established in this paper could be used to provide a rigorous justification for these numerical schemes. For reflected Brownian motions (RBMs) in convex polyhedrons that are semimartingales, there has been some work on establishing the basic adjoint relationship using so-called constrained martingale problems in the unpublished manuscript [11]. In this paper, we establish a different characterization by a different method of proof and deal with the more general setting of curved, non-smooth domains, and reflected diffusions (with state dependent coefficients) that are not necessarily semimartingales, both of which arise in applications (see, e.g., [27, Section 5.6] and [28, 36, 37, 38]).

1.3. **Outline of the Paper.** Section 2 contains a precise definition of the submartingale problem and the associated class of reflected diffusions. In Section 3 the main results of the paper, Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Corollary 3.4, are stated. The proof of Corollary 3.4 is given in Section 3, whereas the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 are deferred to Section 5 and Section 6, respectively. Section 4 contains illustrative examples of reflected diffusions for which the stationary distribution characterization established in this paper is valid. The proofs of some technical lemmas are relegated to the Appendix. First, in the next section, we summarize some common notation used in the paper.

1.4. **Notation and Terminology.** The following notation is used throughout the paper. $\mathbb{Z}$ is the set of integers, $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of positive integers, $\mathbb{R}$ is the set of real numbers, $\mathbb{Z}_+$ is the set of non-negative integers and $\mathbb{R}_+$ the set of non-negative real numbers. For each $J \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{R}^J$ is the J-dimensional Euclidean space and $|\cdot|$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, respectively, denote the Euclidean norm and the inner product on $\mathbb{R}^J$. For each vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^J$ and matrix $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^J \times \mathbb{R}^N$, v^T and σ^T denote the transpose of v and σ, respectively. For each set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^J$, A°, ∂A and $\overline{A}$ denote the interior, boundary and closure of A, respectively. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^J$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^J$, $\text{dist}(x, A)$ is the distance from x to A (that is, $\text{dist}(x, A) = \inf\{y \in A : \ |y - x|\}$). For each $A \subset \mathbb{R}^J$ and $r > 0$, $B_r(A) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \ \text{dist}(y, A) \leq r\}$, and given $\varepsilon > 0$ let $A^\varepsilon \doteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \text{dist}(y, A) < \varepsilon\}$ denote the (open) ε-fattening of A. If $A = \{x\}$, we simply denote $B_r(A)$ by $B_r(x)$. We also let $1\!\!1_B$ denote the indicator function of the set B (that is, $1\!\!1_B(x) = 1$ if $x \in B$ and $1\!\!1_B(x) = 0$ otherwise).

Given a domain E in $\mathbb{R}^n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, let $\mathcal{C}^m(E)$ be the space of real-valued functions that are continuous and m times continuously differentiable on E with partial derivatives of order up to and including m. Also, let $\mathcal{C}_b^m(E)$ be the subspace of $\mathcal{C}^m(E)$ consisting of bounded functions whose partial derivatives of order up to and including m are also bounded, let $\mathcal{C}_c^m(E)$ be the subspace of $\mathcal{C}^m(E)$ consisting of functions that vanish outside compact sets, and let $\mathcal{C}_0^m(E)$ be the subspace of $\mathcal{C}^m(E)$ consisting of functions f that vanish at infinity. In addition, let $\mathcal{C}_c^m(E) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ be the direct sum of $\mathcal{C}_c^m(E)$ and the space of constant functions, that is, the space of functions that are sums of functions in $\mathcal{C}_c^m(E)$ and constants in $\mathbb{R}$. Likewise, let $\mathcal{C}_0^m(E) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ be the space of functions that are sums of functions in $\mathcal{C}_0^m(E)$ and constants in $\mathbb{R}$. If $m = 0$, we denote $\mathcal{C}^m(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_b^m(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_c^m(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_0^m(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_c^m(E) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{C}_0^m(E) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ simply by $\mathcal{C}(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_b(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_c(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_0(E)$, $\mathcal{C}_c(E) \oplus \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{C}_0(E) \oplus \mathbb{R}$, respectively. When E is the closure of a domain, $\mathcal{C}^m(E)$ is to be interpreted as the collection of functions in $\cap_{\varepsilon>0}\mathcal{C}^m(E^\varepsilon)$, where E^ε is an open ε-neighborhood of E, restricted to E. The support of a function f is denoted by $\text{supp}(f)$ and the gradient of f is denoted by ∇f.

The space of continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$ that take values in $\mathbb{R}^J$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}\,[0, \infty)$, the Borel σ-algebra of $\mathcal{C}\,[0, \infty)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{M}$, and the natural filtration on $\mathcal{C}\,[0, \infty)$ is denoted by $\{\mathcal{M}_t\}$. The Borel σ-algebra of $\overline{G}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\overline{G})$.

2. A Class of Reflected Diffusions

In this section we introduce the class of reflected diffusions that we consider. Let G be a nonempty connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^J$, and let $d(\cdot)$ be a set-valued mapping defined on $\overline{G}$, such that each $d(x)$, $x \in \partial G$, is a non-empty closed convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^J$ with vertex at the origin 0, $d(x) = \{0\}$ for each x in G°, and the graph of $d(\cdot)$ is closed, that is, the set $\{(x, v) : x \in \overline{G}, v \in d(x)\}$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2J}$. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a subset of ∂G. As shown in Section 4, $\mathcal{V}$ will typically be a (possibly empty) subset of the non-smooth parts of the boundary of the domain G where $d(\cdot)$ is not sufficiently well behaved. For each function f defined on $\mathbb{R}^J$, we say f is constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$ if for each $x \in \mathcal{V}$, f is constant in some open neighborhood of x. Given measurable drift and dispersion coefficients $b : \mathbb{R}^J \mapsto \mathbb{R}^J$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^J \mapsto \mathbb{R}^J \times \mathbb{R}^N$, and $a = \sigma\sigma^T : \mathbb{R}^J \mapsto \mathbb{R}^J \times \mathbb{R}^J$, let $\mathcal{L}$ be the associated differential operator defined in (1). One way of characterizing a reflected diffusion is through the so-called submartingale problem.

Definition 2.1. *(Submartingale Problem) A family $\{\mathbb{Q}_z, z \in \overline{G}\}$ of probability measures on $(\mathcal{C}\,[0, \infty), \mathcal{M})$ is a solution to the submartingale problem associated with $(G, d(\cdot))$, $\mathcal{V}$, drift $b(\cdot)$ and dispersion $\sigma(\cdot)$ if for each $A \in \mathcal{M}$, the mapping $z \mapsto \mathbb{Q}_z(A)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\overline{G})$-measurable and for each $z \in \overline{G}$, $\mathbb{Q}_z$ satisfies the following three properties:*

1. *$\mathbb{Q}_z(\omega(0) = z) = 1$;*
2. *For every $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\mathbb{R}^J)$ such that f is constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$ and $\langle d, \nabla f(x)\rangle \geq 0$ for all $d \in d(x)$ and $x \in \partial G$, the process*

$$f(\omega(t)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\,du, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3}$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}_z$-submartingale on $(\mathcal{C}\,[0, \infty), \mathcal{M}, \{\mathcal{M}_t\})$;

3. *For every* $z \in \overline{G}$,
$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_z}\left[\int_0^\infty 1\!\!1_{\mathcal{V}}(\omega(s))\,ds\right] = 0.$$

In this case, $\mathbb{Q}_z$ *is said to be a solution to the submartingale problem starting from* z*. Moreover, given a probability distribution* π *on* $\overline{G}$*, the probability measure* $\mathbb{Q}_\pi$*, defined by*

$$\mathbb{Q}_\pi(A) = \int_{\overline{G}} \mathbb{Q}_z(A)\,\pi(dz), \qquad \textit{for every } A \in \mathcal{M}, \tag{4}$$

is said to be a solution to the submartingale problem with initial distribution π*.*

The submartingale problem is a generalization of the martingale problem that was first introduced in [46] to characterize the law of reflected diffusions in smooth domains. Extensions of the submartingale problem to characterize reflected Brownian motions in non-smooth domains were considered in previous works such as [48] for two-dimensional wedges and [52] and [35] for certain convex polyhedral domains. Definition 2.1 generalizes these formulations further to accommodate a more general class of multi-dimensional reflected diffusions. The first condition in Definition 2.1 simply states that the family of measures is parameterized by the initial condition. The second condition in Definition 2.1 captures the notion of diffusive behavior in the interior, and reflection along the appropriate directions on the boundary. Since the "test functions" in property 2 are constant in a neighbourhood of $\mathcal{V}$, this condition does not provide information on the behavior of the diffusion in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$. The third condition is imposed to ensure instantaneous reflection on the boundary (precluding the possibility of absorption or partial reflection at the boundary). The set $\mathcal{V}$ is typically a subset of the non-smooth parts of the boundary. In many cases, there is some flexibility in the choice of $\mathcal{V}$, with several choices yielding equivalent characterizations that are all compatible with the stochastic differential equation (with reflection) formulation. As described in Remark 3.3, there is a canonical choice for $\mathcal{V}$ that is suitable for all the considered examples. It is typically harder to establish uniqueness, rather than existence, of solutions to the submartingale problem. In many cases, it is easier to establish uniqueness, and therefore, well-posedness of the submartingale problem (see Definition 2.2 below) when the set $\mathcal{V}$ is smaller. For further discussion on the formulation of the submartingale problem in the non-smooth setting, see [29].

Definition 2.2. *The submartingale problem associated with* $(G, d(\cdot))$, $\mathcal{V}$, *drift* $b(\cdot)$ *and dispersion* $\sigma(\cdot)$ *is said to be well posed if there exists exactly one solution to the submartingale problem.*

We will only consider submartingale problems that are well posed. In addition, we will also assume throughout, without explicit mention, that the drift and diffusion coefficients are continuous. Under this assumption, for every $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\mathbb{R}^J)$, the mapping $x \mapsto \mathcal{L}f(x)$ is continuous, and so the integral in (3) is clearly well defined.

We now consider reflected diffusions associated to the submartingale problem.

Definition 2.3. *A stochastic process* Z *defined on a probability space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *is said to be a reflected diffusion associated with* $(G, d(\cdot))$, $\mathcal{V}$, *drift* $b(\cdot)$ *and dispersion* $\sigma(\cdot)$ *if its family of distribution laws* $\{\mathbb{Q}_z,\ z \in \overline{G}\}$ *is the unique solution to the submartingale problem, where* $\mathbb{Q}_z$, $z \in \overline{G}$, *is the conditional distribution of* Z *under* $\mathbb{P}$*, conditioned on* $Z(0) = z$*.*

Reflected diffusions are sometimes also defined in terms of weak or strong solutions to stochastic differential equations using the Skorokhod problem or extended Skorokhod problem. The relationship between this formulation and the submartingale problem characterization is studied in [29]. In particular, it is shown that weak solutions to a large class of stochastic differential equations in piecewise smooth domains are associated with well posed submartingale problems.

For our subsequent analysis, it will be convenient to also consider a localized version of the submartingale problem. For each $r > 0$, consider the stopping time

$$\chi^r = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \ |\omega(t)| \geq r\}, \qquad \omega \in \mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)\,. \tag{5}$$

Definition 2.4. *(Localized Submartingale Problem) Fix $r > 0$. A family $\{\mathbb{Q}^r_z, z \in \overline{G}\}$ of probability measures on $(\mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)\,, \mathcal{M})$ is a solution to the submartingale problem associated with $(G, d(\cdot))$, $\mathcal{V}$, drift $b(\cdot)$ and dispersion $\sigma(\cdot)$ that is stopped at the time χ^r if for each $A \in \mathcal{M}$, the map $z \mapsto \mathbb{Q}^r_z(A)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\overline{G})$-measurable and for each $z \in \overline{G}$, $\mathbb{Q}^r_z$ satisfies the following three properties:*

1. $\mathbb{Q}^r_z(\omega(0) = z) = 1$*;*
2. *For every $t \in [0,\infty)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\mathbb{R}^J)$ such that f is constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$ and $\langle d, \nabla f(x)\rangle \geq 0$ for all $d \in d(x)$ and $x \in \partial G$, the process*
$$f(\omega(t\wedge\chi^r)) - \int_0^{t\wedge\chi^r} \mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\,du, \qquad t \geq 0,$$
is a $\mathbb{Q}^r_z$-submartingale on $(\mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)\,, \mathcal{M}, \{\mathcal{M}_t\})$;
3. *For every $z \in \overline{G}$,*
$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^r_z}\left[\int_0^{\chi^r} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}}(\omega(s))\,ds\right] = 0.$$

In this case, $\mathbb{Q}^r_z$ is said to be a solution to the submartingale problem starting from z that is stopped at the time χ^r. Moreover, given a probability distribution π and $\overline{G}$, the probability measure $\mathbb{Q}^r_\pi$, defined as in (4), but with $\mathbb{Q}$ replaced by $\mathbb{Q}^r$, is said to be a solution to the submartingale problem stopped at χ^r with initial distribution π.

Remark 2.5. When the submartingale problem associated with $(G, d(\cdot))$, $\mathcal{V}$, drift $b(\cdot)$ and dispersion $\sigma(\cdot)$ is well posed, for each $r > 0$, the submartingale problem stopped at the stopping time χ^r is also well posed. This can be justified by using an argument similar to the one used in the proof of Theorem 6.1.2 of [46].

3. Main Results

The primary goal of this work is to provide a useful characterization of the stationary distributions of a broad class of reflected diffusions.

Definition 3.1. *A probability measure π on $\overline{G}$ is a stationary distribution for the unique solution $\{\mathbb{Q}_z, z \in \overline{G}\}$ to a well posed submartingale problem if π satisfies the property that the law of $\omega(t)$ under $\mathbb{Q}_\pi$ is π for each $t \geq 0$. In this case, π is also said to be a stationary distribution of any reflected diffusion associated with the well posed submartingale problem.*

The main result of this paper is a necessary and sufficient condition for a probability measure π to be a stationary distribution for the well posed submartingale problem. In what follows, recall that $\mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ is the space of functions that are sums of functions in $\mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$ and constants in $\mathbb{R}$, and that ∇f denotes the gradient of a function f on a domain in $\mathbb{R}^J$. Given a subset $\mathcal{V} \subset \partial G$, let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{V}}$ be the set of functions

$$\mathcal{H} \doteq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) \oplus \mathbb{R} : & f \text{ is constant in a neighborhood of } \mathcal{V}, \\ & \langle d, \nabla f(y) \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for } d \in d(y) \text{ and } y \in \partial G \end{array} \right\}. \tag{6}$$

It is easy to see that if the unique solution $\{\mathbb{Q}_z, z \in \overline{G}\}$ to a well posed submartingale problem associated with $(G, d(\cdot))$ and $\mathcal{V}$ admits a stationary distribution π, then π must satisfy the inequality (2) for all f such that $-f \in \mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the operator defined in (1). Indeed, it follows from the second property in Definition 2.1 that for each f with $-f \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\pi}\left[f(\omega(t)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\,du\right] \geq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\pi}\left[f(\omega(0))\right].$$

Since $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\pi}[f(\omega(t))] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\pi}[f(\omega(0))]$ due to the stationarity of π, this establishes the inequality in (2) for all functions f with $-f \in \mathcal{H}$. We will show that, under two assumptions stated below, the later condition is also sufficient for any probability measure π with $\pi(\partial G) = 0$ to be a stationary distribution of $\{\mathbb{Q}_z, z \in \overline{G}\}$.

The first assumption is the existence of a family of test functions, which is used in Section 5.3 to establish the tightness of a certain sequence of approximating probability measures.

Assumption 1. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a family of nonnegative functions $\{f_{x,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G}),\ x \in \overline{G} \cap B_N(0)\}$ and constants $C(N,\varepsilon) > 0$ and $c(N,\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following three properties hold:*

1. *$f_{x,\varepsilon}$ is a finite or countable sum of functions in $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$;*
2. *For each $y \in \overline{G}$, $f_{x,\varepsilon}(y) = 0$ if $|y-x| \leq \varepsilon/2$, and $f_{x,\varepsilon}(y) > c(N,\varepsilon)$ if $|y-x| > 3\varepsilon$;*
3. *$|\mathcal{L}f_{x,\varepsilon}(y)| \leq C(N,\varepsilon)$ for each $y \in \overline{G}$.*

The second assumption concerns the geometry of the set $\mathcal{V}$.

Assumption 2. *The set $\mathcal{V}$ is finite and for each $x \in \mathcal{V}$, there exist a unit vector $v_x \neq 0$ and positive constants α_x, r_x such that $\langle v_x, y - x \rangle \geq \alpha_x |y - x|$, $v_x^T a(y) v_x \geq \alpha_x$ and $\langle v_x, d \rangle \geq 0$ for all $d \in d(y)$ and all $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)$.*

We now state the first main result of this paper. Its proof is given in Section 5. Recall that we assume throughout that the drift and diffusion coefficients are continuous.

Theorem 1. *Suppose we are given $(G, d(\cdot))$, $b(\cdot)$, $\sigma(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{V}$ such that the associated submartingale problem is well posed and Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Let π be a probability measure on $(\overline{G}, \mathcal{B}(\overline{G}))$ with $\pi(\partial G) = 0$. Then π satisfies the inequality (2) for all $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ if and only if π is a stationary distribution for the unique solution to the associated submartingale problem.*

The necessity of the condition stated in Theorem 1 is, as shown above, straightforward. On the other hand, the proof of sufficiency, which is given in Section 5, entails first constructing a suitable sequence of Markov chains with stationary distribution π and then showing that the sequence converges to a solution of the submartingale problem. Both steps are more involved when the domain is not smooth, in part due to the difficulty of estimating the amount of time the reflected diffusion spends near the boundary, especially in the neighborhood of the set $\mathcal{V} \subset \partial G$.

We now introduce a broad class of data $(G, d(\cdot))$ and $\mathcal{V}$ for which the stationary distribution characterization obtained in Theorem 1 applies.

Definition 3.2. *The pair $(G, d(\cdot))$ is said to be piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection if G and $d(\cdot)$ satisfy the following properties:*

1. *The domain G is a non-empty domain with representation $G = \bigcap_{i\in\mathcal{I}} G_i$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is a finite index set and for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, G_i is a non-empty domain with $\mathcal{C}^1$ boundary, that is, there exists a continuously differentiable function ϕ^i on $\mathbb{R}^J$ such that*
$$G_i = \{x : \phi^i(x) > 0\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \partial G_i = \{x : \phi^i(x) = 0\}.$$
Let $n^i(x)$ denote the unit inward normal vector to ∂G_i at $x \in \partial G_i$ and define
$$\mathcal{I}(x) \doteq \{i \in \mathcal{I} :\ x \in \partial G_i\},$$
and for each $x \in \partial G$, let
$$n(x) \doteq \left\{ \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} s_i n^i(x), s_i \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{I}(x) \right\}.$$
2. *The direction vector field $d(\cdot)$ is given by*
$$d(x) \doteq \left\{ \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} s_i \gamma^i(x),\ s_i \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{I}(x) \right\}, \qquad x \in \partial G,$$
where for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, $\gamma^i(\cdot)$ is a continuous vector field associated with G_i such that $\langle n^i(x), \gamma^i(x)\rangle > 0$ for each $x \in \partial G_i$.

If, in addition, $n^i(\cdot)$ is constant (so that the domain G is a polyhedron) and $\gamma^i(\cdot)$ is also constant, then the pair $(G, d(\cdot))$ will be said to be polyhedral with piecewise constant reflection.

Given $(G, d(\cdot))$ that is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection, we can assume, without loss of generality that for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\langle n^i(x), \gamma^i(x)\rangle = 1, \qquad \text{for each } x \in \partial G_i. \tag{7}$$

In the analysis of reflected diffusions in non-smooth domains, a special role is played by the following set on the boundary:

$$\mathcal{U} \doteq \{x \in \partial G : \exists n \in n(x) \text{ such that } \langle n, d\rangle > 0,\ \forall d \in d(x) \setminus \{0\}\}. \tag{8}$$

Assumption 2'. $\mathcal{V}$ is a finite set such that $\mathcal{V} \supset \partial G \setminus \mathcal{U}$, and for each $x \in \mathcal{V}$, there exist a unit vector v_x, constants $r_x > 0$, $\alpha_x > 0$ and $0 < c_x^1 < 1 < c_x^2 < \infty$ such that for all $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)$, the following properties are satisfied with $\Theta_x \doteq \{z \in \mathbb{R}^J :\ \langle z, v_x\rangle \geq 0\}$:

(1) $\langle v_x, y - x\rangle \geq \alpha_x |y - x|$;
(2) $\gamma^i(y) \in \Theta_x$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}(y) \subset \mathcal{I}(x)$;
(3) for every $r \in (0, r_x/c_x^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{G} \cap B_{c_x^1 r}(x) &\subseteq \{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x) :\ \operatorname{dist}(y, x + r v_x + \Theta_x) > 0\} \\ &\subseteq \overline{G} \cap B_{c_x^2 r}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

(4) $v_x^T a(y) v_x \geq \alpha_x$ for all $y \in B_{r_x}(x)$;

Remark 3.3. Note that Assumption 2' is trivially satisfied when $\partial G = \mathcal{U}$, and $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$. The condition that $\partial G = \mathcal{U}$ ensures that at each $x \in \partial G$ there exists a normal vector $n \in n(x)$ that makes a strictly positive inner product with all unit reflection vectors $d \in d(x)$. It can be viewed as a generalization of what is known in the literature as the completely-$\mathcal{S}$ condition. A canonical choice is to define $\mathcal{V}$ to be equal to the set of points on ∂G at which this condition fails to hold. In the context of certain polyhedral domains with piecewise constant reflection fields, the stipulation that the completely-$\mathcal{S}$ condition hold has been shown to be necessary and sufficient for the associated reflected diffusion to be a semimartingale [35, 40, 47]. However, in this work we also allow for cases when $\partial G \neq \mathcal{U}$, thus providing a characterization of the stationary distribution for reflected diffusions that are not necessarily semimartingales [21, 28, 35].

We now state the second main result of this paper, whose proof is given in Section 6.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that either $(G, d(\cdot))$ is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection and G is bounded, or $(G, d(\cdot))$ is polyhedral with piecewise constant reflection. If Assumption 2' is satisfied and the drift and dispersion coefficients $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ are uniformly bounded, then $(G, d(\cdot))$ and $\mathcal{V}$ satisfy Assumptions 1 and 2.*

As an immediate consequence we see that Theorem 1 can be used to characterize the stationary distributions of reflected diffusions that satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2 and are associated with well-posed submartingale problems. As shown in Section 4, this includes many classes of reflected diffusions that arise in applications. But Theorem 1 is also applicable to reflected diffusions outside the class described by Theorem 2. An illustrative example is given in Example 4.5 of Section 4.

To state the last main result of this paper, we introduce $\mathcal{L}^*$, the adjoint operator to $\mathcal{L}$: for $p \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{G})$,

$$\mathcal{L}^* p(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} (a_{ij}(x) p(x)) - \sum_{i=1}^{J} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (b_i(x) p(x)).$$

We now show that nonnegative and integrable solutions of the so-called basic adjoint relation (BAR) are indeed stationary distributions for the submartingale problem. In what follows, let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the smooth parts of the boundary ∂G.

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose that the pair $(G, d(\cdot))$ is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection, (7) is satisfied, $\mathcal{V} \subset \partial G$ satisfies Assumption 2' and $b_i(\cdot), a_{ij}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{G})$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, J$, and the submartingale problem associated with $(G, d(\cdot))$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is well posed. Furthermore, suppose there exists a non-negative function $p \in \mathcal{C}^2(\overline{G})$ that satisfies $\int_{\overline{G}} p(x)dx < \infty$ and the following partial differential equation with boundary conditions:*

1. $\mathcal{L}^* p(x) = 0$ *for* $x \in G$;
2. *for each* $i \in \mathcal{I}$ *and* $x \in \partial G_i \cap \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} -2p(x) \left\langle n^i(x), b(x) \right\rangle + (n^i(x))^T a(x) \nabla p(x) + p(x) K_i(x) \\ -\nabla \cdot (p(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x) n^i(x) \gamma^i(x) - p(x) a(x) n^i(x)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K_i(x) \doteq \left\langle n^i(x), \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\partial a_{\cdot j}(x)}{\partial x_j} \right\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^J n_k^i(x) \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\partial a_{kj}}{\partial x_j}(x);$$

3. *for each* $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$, $i \neq j$ *and* $x \in \partial G_i \cap \partial G_j \cap \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$,

$$p(x)\left(\left\langle n^j(x), (n^i(x))^T a(x) n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)\right\rangle \right.$$
$$\left. + \left\langle n^i(x), (n^j(x))^T a(x) n^j(x)\gamma^j(x) - a(x)n^j(x)\right\rangle\right) = 0.$$

Then the probability measure on $\overline{G}$ *defined by*

$$\pi(A) \doteq \frac{\int_A p(x)dx}{\int_{\overline{G}} p(x)dx}, \qquad A \in \mathcal{B}(\overline{G}), \tag{10}$$

is a stationary distribution for the well posed submartingale problem.

Proof. By Theorems 1 and 2, it suffices to show that the probability measure π defined in terms of p via (10) satisfies the inequality (2) for all functions f such that $-f \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$. For any such function f, straightforward calculations show that for each $x \in \overline{G}$,

$$p(x)\mathcal{L}f(x) - f(x)\mathcal{L}^*p(x) = \frac{1}{2}\nabla \cdot H(x),$$

where $H = H^f$ is the vector field such that its ith component is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_i(x) &= \sum_{j=1}^J \left(p(x)a_{ij}(x)\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_j} - f(x)a_{ij}(x)\frac{\partial p(x)}{\partial x_j} - f(x)p(x)\frac{\partial a_{ij}(x)}{\partial x_j}\right) \\ &\quad +2b_i(x)f(x)p(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}^*p(x) = 0$ for $x \in G$, the Divergence Theorem implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\overline{G}} \mathcal{L}f(x)p(x)dx &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial G} \langle n(x), H(x)\rangle \mu(dx) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \int_{\partial G_i \cap \partial G} \left\langle n^i(x), H(x)\right\rangle d\mu_i(x), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $n(\cdot)$ is the outward pointing unit normal field on ∂G, $\mu(dx)$ is the surface measure on ∂G, and $\mu_i(dx)$ is the surface measure on $\partial G \cap \partial G_i$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Note that for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $x \in \partial G \cap \partial G_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle n^i(x), H(x)\right\rangle &= p(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x)\nabla f(x) - f(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x)\nabla p(x) \\ &\quad -f(x)p(x)K_i(x) + 2f(x)p(x)\left\langle n^i(x), b(x)\right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above display, (11) and condition 2 in the theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\overline{G}} \mathcal{L}f(x)p(x)dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \int_{\partial G_i\cap\partial G} p(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x)\nabla f(x)d\mu_i(x) \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \int_{\partial G_i\cap\partial G} f(x)\nabla\cdot(p(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - p(x)a(x)n^i(x))d\mu_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $x \in \partial G_i \cap \partial G$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla \cdot (f(x)p(x)[(n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)]) \\
&\quad = f(x)\nabla \cdot (p(x)[(n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)]) \\
&\qquad + \langle \gamma^i(x), \nabla f(x)\rangle p(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x) - p(x)(\nabla f(x))^T a(x)n^i(x).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the last two equalities that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\overline{G}} \mathcal{L}f(x)p(x)dx \\
= \;& \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \int_{\partial G_i \cap \partial G} \nabla \cdot (f(x)p(x)((n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)))d\mu_i(x) \\
&-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \int_{\partial G_i \cap \partial G} \langle \gamma^i(x), \nabla f(x)\rangle p(x)(n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)d\mu_i(x).
\end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right-hand side of the above equality is non-positive since $-f \in \mathcal{H}$, $p \geq 0$ and a is positive semidefinite. So, we shall focus on the first term on the right-hand side of the above display. Now, for each $x \in \partial G_i \cap \partial G$, $\langle n^i(x), (n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)\rangle = 0$ because of the assumed normalization $\langle n^i(x), \gamma^i(x)\rangle = 1$. Therefore, the vector $(n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)$ is parallel to ∂G_i at x, and the divergence in the first term on the right-hand side of the above display is equal to the divergence taken in the $(J-1)$-dimensional manifold $\partial G_i \cap \partial G$. Another application of the Divergence Theorem then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \int_{\partial G_i \cap \partial G} \nabla \cdot (f(x)p(x)((n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)))d\mu_i(x) \\
&= \sum_{i,j\in\mathcal{I}, i\neq j} \int_{F_{ij}\setminus\mathcal{V}} f(x)p(x) \left\langle n^{ij}(x), (n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)\right\rangle d\mu_{ij}(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where $F_{ij} \doteq \partial G_i \cap \partial G_j \cap \partial G$, $n^{ij}(x)$ denotes the unit vector that is normal to both F_{ij} and $n^i(x)$ at x and points into $\partial G_i \cap \mathcal{S}$ from F_{ij}, and $\mu_{ij}(dx)$ is the surface measure on the $(J-2)$-dimensional manifold F_{ij}. To prove the theorem, it suffices to show that the last equality in the above display is zero. To do this, it suffices to show that for each $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$ with $i \neq j$ and $x \in F_{ij} \setminus \mathcal{V}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(12) \qquad & p(x)\left(\left\langle n^{ij}(x), (n^i(x))^T a(x)n^i(x)\gamma^i(x) - a(x)n^i(x)\right\rangle\right. \\
&\left. + \left\langle n^{ji}(x), (n^j(x))^T a(x)n^j(x)\gamma^j(x) - a(x)n^j(x)\right\rangle\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $n^{ij}(x)$ is normal to $\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j$ at $x \in \partial G_i \cap \partial G_j$, it must lie in the two dimensional space spanned by $n^i(x)$ and $n^j(x)$. In addition, $n^{ij}(x)$ is a unit vector normal to $n^i(x)$ and points into ∂G_i from $\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j$. Then we have

$$n^{ij}(x) = (n^j(x) - \langle n^i(x), n^j(x)\rangle n^i(x))/(1 - \langle n^i(x), n^j(x)\rangle^2)^{1/2}$$

and

$$n^{ji}(x) = (n^i(x) - \langle n^i(x), n^j(x)\rangle n^j(x))/(1 - \langle n^i(x), n^j(x)\rangle^2)^{1/2}.$$

With the above two representations, we see that (12) is equivalent to condition (3) in the theorem. This yields the desired result. □

4. Examples

In this section, we provide several examples of reflected diffusions in general domains for which the submartingale problem is well posed and Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied, so that Theorem 1 provides a characterization of their stationary distributions. The examples serve to illustrate the range of applicability of the main result of the paper. In the first three examples, the reflected diffusions are semimartingales, whereas in the last two examples they fail to be semimartingales, two of the examples deal with curved domains and three of the examples are multi-dimensional. For simplicity, in all cases we assume that b and σ are continuous and uniformly bounded and that when $\mathcal{V} \neq \emptyset$, a is uniformly elliptic (although only the partial uniform ellipticity in the direction v_x of Assumption 2 is actually required).

We start with the simple case of smooth domains.

Example 4.1. Let G be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^J$ such that $G = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J : \ \phi(x) > 0\}$, where $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2_b(\mathbb{R}^J)$ and $|\nabla\phi| \geq 1$ on ∂G. Thus, $\nabla\phi(x)$ is the inward normal vector at $x \in \partial G$. Let $\gamma(\cdot)$ be a bounded Lipschitz continuous vector field that satisfies $\langle \nabla\phi(x), \gamma(x)\rangle > 0$ on ∂G, and let $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$. Then it trivially follows that $(G, d(\cdot))$ is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ domain with continuous reflection and, since $\mathcal{U} = \partial G$, Assumption 2' is trivially satisfied with $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$. By [45] (see Theorems 3.1 and 5.4 therein) the associated submartingale problem is well posed. Moreover, since G is bounded, Theorem 2 shows that Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied (the latter holding trivially).

Example 4.2. Consider a two-dimensional wedge G given in polar coordinates by

$$G = \{(r,\theta) : \ 0 \leq \theta \leq \zeta, \ r \geq 0\},$$

where $\zeta \in (0,\pi)$ is the angle of the wedge. Then G admits the representation $G = G_1 \cap G_2$, where G_1 and G_2 are the two half planes

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \{(r,\theta) : \ 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi, \ r \geq 0\}, \\ G_2 &= \{(r,\theta) : \ \zeta - \pi \leq \theta \leq \zeta, \ r \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let the directions of reflection on ∂G_1 and ∂G_2 be specified as constant vectors γ^1 and γ^2 normalized such that for $j = 1, 2$, $\langle \gamma^j, n^j\rangle = 1$. For $j = 1, 2$, define the angle of reflection θ_j to be the angle between n^j and γ^j, such that θ_j is positive if and only if γ^j points towards the origin. Note that $-\pi/2 < \theta_j < \pi/2$. Define $\alpha = (\theta_1 + \theta_2)/\zeta$. It was proved in [48] that the submartingale problem is well posed when $\alpha < 2$.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{0\}$. For every $\alpha < 2$, it is easily verified that $\mathcal{U}$ contains $\partial G \setminus \{0\}$, and so $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the first property stated in Assumption 2'. In fact, when $\alpha < 1$, $\mathcal{U} = \partial G$ and so there exists a positive combination n_0 of n^1 and n^2 such that $\langle n_0, \gamma^j\rangle > 0$ for $j = 1, 2$. Since $\zeta \in (0,\pi)$, it is obvious that $\langle n_0, x\rangle > 0$ for each $x \in \overline{G}$. On the other hand, when $\alpha = 1$, γ^1 and γ^2 are pointing towards each other. In this case, G lies on one side of the line through the vertex that is parallel to γ^1 and γ^2. Let n_0 be a unit vector perpendicular to the line that points into the half-space that contains G, that is, let $\langle n_0, x\rangle > 0$ for each $x \in \overline{G}\setminus\{0\}$. In either case, let $\Theta(0) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \ \langle n_0, y\rangle \geq 0\}$. It can be verified that the properties of Assumption 2' hold with the choice of $r_0 = \infty$, $\alpha_0 = \inf\{\langle n_0, x\rangle : \ |x| = 1, x \in \overline{G}\} > 0$, $c_0^1 = 1/2$ and $c_0^2 = \max\{1/\sin(\zeta + \theta_1), 1/\sin(\theta_1)\}$. Thus, $\mathcal{V} = \{0\}$ satisfies Assumption 2'. Since $(G, d(\cdot))$ is polyhedral with constant reflection, Assumptions 1 and 2 hold by Theorem 2.

Example 4.3. We now describe another class of RBMs in the orthant that arise as diffusion approximations of queueing networks [40] and of Leontief systems in economics [39]. In this case, $G = \mathbb{R}^J_+$ is the non-negative orthant in $\mathbb{R}^J$, which admits the representation $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^J G_i$, where $G_i \doteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J : x_i \geq 0\}$, and the direction vector field γ^i on G_i is a constant vector field, pointing in a direction $d^i \in \mathbb{R}^J$. Moreover, the matrix D with column d^i is assumed to satisfy the completely-$\mathcal{S}$ condition, which implies that $\mathcal{U} = \partial G$. Thus, by Remark 3.3, Assumption 2' is trivially satisfied with $\mathcal{V} = \emptyset$. In this case, it was shown in [47] that the stochastic differential equation with reflection associated with G and $d(\cdot)$ admits a weak solution that is unique in law. By Theorem 2 of [29] it then follows that the submartingale problem is well posed. Moreover, since $(G, d(\cdot))$ is polyhedral, once again Theorem 2 shows that Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied.

Example 4.4. Generalized processor sharing (GPS) is a service discipline used in high-speed networks that allows for efficient sharing of a single resource amongst traffic of different classes. It was shown in [13, 15, 16, 37] that the GPS discipline can be modelled in terms of an associated (extended) Skorokhod problem or, equivalently, a submartingale problem. We now introduce a class of RBMs that were shown in [37] and [38] to arise as reflected diffusion approximations of multiclass queueing networks using this scheduling discipline. The two-dimensional case also corresponds to the case $\alpha = 1$ and $\pi = 90°$ in Example 4.2.

The state space G associated with the GPS ESP has the representation

$$G = \bigcap_{i=1}^{J+1} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J : \langle x, n^i \rangle > 0\},$$

where $n^i = e_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, J$ (here $\{e_i, i = 1, \ldots, J\}$ is the standard orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{R}^J$) and $n_{J+1} = \sum_{i=1}^J e_i/\sqrt{J}$. The reflection vector field is piecewise constant on each face, governed by the vectors $\{\gamma^i,\ i = 1, ..., J+1\}$ that are defined as follows: $\gamma^{J+1} = \sum_{i=1}^J e_i/\sqrt{J}$ and $\{\gamma^i, i = 1, \ldots, J\}$ are defined in terms of a "weight" vector $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^J_+$ that satisfies $\bar{\alpha}_i > 0$ for each $i = 1, ..., J$ and $\sum_{i=1}^J \bar{\alpha}_i = 1$: for $i, j = 1, \ldots, J$,

$$\gamma^i_j = \begin{cases} -\dfrac{\bar{\alpha}_j}{1 - \bar{\alpha}_i} & \text{for } j \neq i, \\ \qquad 1 & \text{for } j = i. \end{cases}$$

It is easily verified that the generalized completely-$\mathcal{S}$ condition is satisfied at all points in $\partial G \backslash \{0\}$ (see Lemma 3.4 of [35]). Therefore, $\mathcal{V} = \{0\}$ satisfies the first property in Assumption 2'. Moreover, note that $d(0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J : \langle x, d_{J+1} \rangle \geq 0\}$. Choose $n_0 = d_{J+1}$, $r_0 = \infty$, $\alpha_0 = 1$, $c_0^1 = 1$, and $c_0^2 = \sqrt{J}$ and $\Theta(0) = d(0)$. Then $\langle n_0, y \rangle \geq c_0 |y|$ for every $y \in \overline{G}$ and $\overline{G} \cap B_{c_0^1 r}(0) \subseteq \{y \in \overline{G} :\ \mathrm{dist}(y, rn_0 + \Theta(0)) > 0\} \subseteq B_{c_0^2 r}(0)$ for each $r \geq 0$. Then $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies Assumption 2' and $G, d(\cdot)$ is polyhedral. Therefore, Theorem 2 shows that Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. The fact that the associated stochastic differential equation with reflection has a pathwise unique solution follows from Corollary 4.4 of [35]. Hence, well-posedness of the submartingale problem follows from Theorem 2 of [29].

Example 4.5. Consider a two-dimensional domain G with representation

$$G = \{(x, y) :\ x \geq 0,\ -x^\beta < y < x^\beta\}, \qquad \beta > 1.$$

The domain G has a cusp at the origin and $G = G_1 \cap G_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \{(x,y) : \; y < x^{\beta} \text{ when } x \geq 0 \text{ and } y < 0 \text{ when } x < 0\}, \\ G_2 &= \{(x,y) : \; y > -x^{\beta} \text{ when } x \geq 0 \text{ and } y > 0 \text{ when } x < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $j = 1, 2$ and $z \in \partial G_j$, let $n^j(z)$ be the inward unit normal vector to ∂G_j and let $\gamma^j(z)$ make a constant angle $\theta_j \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ with $n^j(z)$. We take $\theta_j > 0$ if and only if the first component of $\gamma^j(z)$ is negative, that is, $\gamma^j(z)$ points towards the origin, in small neighborhoods of the origin. Since $\theta_j \neq \pm\pi/2$, we can without loss of generality assume the normalization $\langle \gamma^j(z), n^j(z)\rangle = 1$ holds. It was proved in [8] that the submartingale problem is well posed when $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \leq 0$.

With the choice $\mathcal{V} = \{0\}$, it is clear that the first condition of Assumption 2' is satisfied. To see that the second set of properties is also satisfied, let n_0 be a unit vector that is perpendicular to $\gamma^1(0)$ and points towards G, and as usual let $\Theta(0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \; \langle n_0, x\rangle \geq 0\}$. It is easy to see that $\gamma^j(0) \in \Theta(0)$ for $j = 1, 2$ and that there exist $r_0 > 0$, $\alpha_0 > 0$, $c_0^1 > 0$ and $c_0^2 > 0$ such that $\langle n_0, y\rangle \geq \alpha_0 |y|$ for every $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_0}(0)$ and $\overline{G} \cap B_{c_0^1 r}(0) \subseteq \{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_0}(0) : \; \text{dist}(y, rn_0 + \Theta(0)) > 0\} \subseteq B_{c_0^2 r}(0)$ for each $r \in (0, r_0/2)$. Thus, $(G, d(\cdot))$ is clearly piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection and $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies Assumption 2', which immediately implies Assumption 2 is satisfied. Since G is neither bounded nor a polyhedral domain, Theorem 2 cannot be applied directly to show that Assumption 1 holds. But a similar argument as the one used in the proof of Theorem 2 can be used to establish Assumption 1. The details are deferred to Appendix B.

5. Proof of Theorem 1

Let π be a probability measure on $(\overline{G}, \mathcal{B}(\overline{G}))$ such that $\pi(\partial G) = 0$. The discussion prior to the statement of Theorem 1 shows that (2) is a necessary condition for π to be a stationary distribution of the submartingale problem. So, it only remains to prove the sufficiency of the condition (2). For the remainder of this section we assume that π has the additional property that it satisfies (2) for every $-f \in \mathcal{H}$, and prove that then π is a stationary distribution for the well posed submartingale problem. The proof consists of two main steps. In the first step, which is carried out in Section 5.1, a sequence of discrete time Markov chains is constructed such that π is the stationary distribution for each Markov chain in the sequence. In the second step, which is presented in Sections 5.2–5.4, it is first shown that the sequence of continuous time extensions of the Markov chains converges to the unique solution of the submartingale problem with initial distribution π. The fact that π is a stationary distribution for each Markov chain in the approximating sequence is then used to deduce that π is a stationary distribution for the submartingale problem.

5.1. **Construction of Markov Chains.** In what follows, let $\mathcal{H}$ be the class of functions defined in (6) and let $\lambda > 0$ be a given constant. We shall construct a discrete time Markov chain $\{X^{\lambda}(n\lambda), \; n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ that has π as its stationary distribution and satisfies an inequality that is analogous to property 2 of the submartingale problem.

We first state a preliminary lemma. This lemma is similar to Lemma 3 of [49], but the class of functions $\mathcal{H}$ considered here also takes into account the set $\mathcal{V}$. For completeness, we provide the proof of the lemma in Appendix C.

Lemma 5.1. *Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n$, for each concave function $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ that is monotone increasing in each variable separately, and any $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\overline{G}} &\psi\left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) d\pi(y)\\ &\geq \int_{\overline{G}} \psi\left(f_1(y) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f_n(y)\right) d\pi(y).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let r_i be a bounded non-negative function defined on $\overline{G}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $z = (z_1, \cdots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let the function $\psi: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by*

$$\psi(z_1, \cdots, z_n) \doteq \inf_{x \in \overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i \right).$$

Then ψ is continuous, concave and monotone increasing in each variable separately.

Proof. Since ψ is the pointwise infimum of affine functions and r_i is non-negative for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$, then it is not hard to see that ψ is concave and is monotone increasing in each variable separately. We next show that ψ is continuous, which completes the proof of the lemma. Fix $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\{z^m,\ m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $z^m \to z$ as $m \to \infty$. By the definition of $\psi(z)$, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $x \in \overline{G}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i < \psi(z) + \varepsilon$. Since $z^m \to z$ and r_i is bounded for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$, for all m large enough, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i^m < \psi(z) + 2\varepsilon$. This shows that $\psi(z^m) < \psi(z) + 2\varepsilon$ for all m large enough. Thus, by taking limsup and then $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have $\limsup_{m \to \infty} \psi(z^m) \leq \psi(z)$. On the other hand, For each $x \in \overline{G}$, $\psi(z) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i$ by definition. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, $\sup_{x \in \overline{G}} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) |z_i^m - z_i| < \varepsilon$ for all m large enough since r_i is bounded for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then $\psi(z) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i^m + \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \overline{G}$ and all m large enough. It follows that $\psi(z) \leq \inf_{x \in \overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i^m\right) + \varepsilon$ for all m large enough and hence $\psi(z) \leq \liminf_{m \to \infty} \psi(z^m)$. As a result, we have $\lim_{m \to \infty} \psi(z^m) = \psi(z)$ and ψ is continuous at $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This shows that ψ is continuous. □

For each function $v \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$, define $\Upsilon_\lambda(v)$ as follows:

$$\Upsilon_\lambda(v) \doteq \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (r_1, \cdots, r_n, f_1, \cdots, f_n, S) : n \in \mathbb{N}, f_i \in \mathcal{H}, \\ r_i \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G}),\ \inf\limits_{x \in \overline{G}} r_i(x) \geq 0,\ i = 1, \ldots, n, \\ S \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{G}),\ \text{and } \forall x, y \in \overline{G}, \\ \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x)(f_i(y) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f_i(y)) + S(y) \geq v(x, y) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{13}$$

Thus, it is easy to see that $\Upsilon_\lambda(v)$ is non-empty for each $v \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$.

For each $v \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$, define

$$Q_{\lambda+}(v) \doteq \inf \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \displaystyle\int_{\overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) f_i(x) + S(x) \right) d\pi(x) : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ (r_1, \cdots, r_n, f_1, \cdots, f_n, S) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(v) \end{array} \right\}, \tag{14}$$

and

$$Q_{\lambda-}(v) \doteq -Q_{\lambda+}(-v). \tag{15}$$

Then the functionals $Q_{\lambda+}$ and $Q_{\lambda-}$ are real-valued on $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G}\times\overline{G})$ and satisfy the following properties. We use $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$, respectively, to represent the identically zero and the identically one functions on $\overline{G}\times\overline{G}$. Then $\mathbf{0},\ \mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G}\times\overline{G})$.

Proposition 5.3. *For each* $v,\ v_1,\ v_2 \in \mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G}\times\overline{G})$, $t \geq 0$ *and* $C, C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$,

1. $Q_{\lambda+}(\mathbf{0}) \geq 0$;
2. $Q_{\lambda+}(v_1+v_2) \leq Q_{\lambda+}(v_1) + Q_{\lambda+}(v_2)$ *and* $Q_{\lambda+}(tv) = tQ_{\lambda+}(v)$;
3. $Q_{\lambda-}(v) \leq Q_{\lambda+}(v)$;
4. $Q_{\lambda-}(C\mathbf{1}) = Q_{\lambda+}(C\mathbf{1}) = C$;
5. *if* $v_1 \leq v_2$, *then* $Q_{\lambda+}(v_1) \leq Q_{\lambda+}(v_2)$ *and* $Q_{\lambda-}(v_1) \leq Q_{\lambda-}(v_2)$;
6. *if* $C_1\mathbf{1} \leq v \leq C_2\mathbf{1}$, *then* $C_1 \leq Q_{\lambda-}(v) \leq Q_{\lambda+}(v) \leq C_2$.

Proof. We start with the proof of the first property. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$(r_1, \cdots, r_n, f_1, \cdots, f_n, S) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(\mathbf{0}).$$

It follows from Lemma 5.2 that the function $\psi:\ \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\psi(z_1, \cdots, z_n) \doteq \inf_{x\in\overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) z_i \right)$$

is continuous, concave and monotone increasing in each variable separately. For each $\alpha > 0$, let $\phi_\alpha:\ \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function (mollifier) that satisfies $\phi_\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\phi_\alpha \geq 0, \qquad \operatorname{supp}(\phi_\alpha) \subset B_\alpha(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\alpha(x)\,dx = 1.$$

Letting $*$ stand for the convolution operation, we define

$$\psi^\alpha \doteq \psi * \phi_\alpha.$$

Then $\psi^\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and ψ^α is also concave and monotone increasing in each variable separately. It follows from Lemma 5.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\overline{G}} \psi^\alpha\left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) d\pi(y) \\ &\qquad \geq \int_{\overline{G}} \psi^\alpha\left(f_1(y) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f_1(y)\right) d\pi(y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f_i \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $\psi^\alpha \to \psi$ pointwise as $\alpha \to 0$, by sending $\alpha \to 0$ and applying the dominated convergence theorem to both sides of the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\overline{G}} \inf_{x\in\overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) f_i(y) \right) d\pi(y) \\ &\qquad \geq \int_{\overline{G}} \inf_{x\in\overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x)(f_i(y) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f_i(y)) \right) d\pi(y). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Thus, for every $(r_1, \cdots, r_n, f_1, \cdots, f_n, S) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(\mathbf{0})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, using (16) and the definition of $\Upsilon_\lambda(\mathbf{0})$ given in (13), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(y) f_i(y) + S(y) \right) d\pi(y) \\
&\quad \geq \int_{\overline{G}} \left(\inf_{x \in \overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) f_i(y) \right) + S(y) \right) d\pi(y) \\
&\quad \geq \int_{\overline{G}} \left(\inf_{x \in \overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(x) (f_i(y) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f_i(y)) \right) + S(y) \right) d\pi(y) \\
&\quad \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Property 1 is then a consequence of the definition of $Q_{\lambda+}$ given in (14).

The second property follows from the definition of $Q_{\lambda+}$ in (14) and the observations that

$$(r_1^j, \cdots, r_{n_j}^j, f_1^j, \cdots, f_{n_j}^j, S^j) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(v_j) \qquad \text{for } j = 1, 2,$$

imply

$$(r_1^1, \cdots, r_{n_1}^1, r_1^2, \cdots, r_{n_2}^2, f_1^1, \cdots, f_{n_1}^1, f_1^2, \cdots, f_{n_2}^2, S^1 + S^2) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(v_1 + v_2)$$

and that

$$(r_1, \cdots, r_n, f_1, \cdots, f_n, S) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(v)$$

if and only if

$$(r_1, \cdots, r_n, t f_1, \cdots, t f_n, t S) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(t v).$$

Now, the definition of $Q_{\lambda-}$ in (15) and properties 1 and 2 of $Q_{\lambda+}$ just established above imply that

$$Q_{\lambda+}(v) - Q_{\lambda-}(v) = Q_{\lambda+}(v) + Q_{\lambda+}(-v) \geq Q_{\lambda+}(\mathbf{0}) \geq 0,$$

which establishes the third property.

Since $(r_1, f_1, S) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, C\mathbf{1}) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(C\mathbf{1})$ and π is a probability measure, it follows from the definition (14) of $Q_{\lambda+}$ that

$$Q_{\lambda+}(C\mathbf{1}) \leq C.$$

Replacing C by $-C$ in the last inequality and using (15), this implies that

$$Q_{\lambda-}(C\mathbf{1}) = -Q_{\lambda+}(-C\mathbf{1}) \geq -(-C) = C.$$

Thus, property 4 follows from property 3 and the last two assertions. Since $\Upsilon_\lambda(v_2) \subseteq \Upsilon_\lambda(v_1)$ when $v_1 \leq v_2$, property 5 is an immediate consequence of the definitions of $Q_{\lambda+}$ and $Q_{\lambda-}$ given in (14) and (15), respectively. Property 6 is easily deduced from properties 3–5. □

Properties 2 and 4 of Proposition 5.3 show that $Q_{\lambda+}$ is a sublinear functional on $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$ and $C = Q_{\lambda+}(C\mathbf{1}) = Q_{\lambda-}(C\mathbf{1})$ for each $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$ is a vector space. Let Λ_λ be the linear functional on the space of constant functions on $\overline{G} \times \overline{G}$ defined by

$$\Lambda_\lambda(C\mathbf{1}) = C.$$

By the Hahn-Banach theorem and the definitions of $Q_{\lambda+}$ and $Q_{\lambda-}$, Λ_λ can be extended to a linear functional on $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$ that satisfies

$$Q_{\lambda-} \leq \Lambda_\lambda \leq Q_{\lambda+}. \tag{17}$$

Together with property 6 of Proposition 5.3, this implies that $\Lambda_\lambda(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ and Λ_λ is a positive linear functional on $\mathcal{C}_b(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$ and hence on $\mathcal{C}_0(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$. Thus, by the Riesz representation theorem and the fact that $\Lambda_\lambda(C\mathbf{1}) = C$, there exists a probability measure ν_λ on $\overline{G} \times \overline{G}$ with

$$\Lambda_\lambda(v) = \int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} v(x,y)\, d\nu_\lambda(x,y) \qquad \text{for each } v \in \mathcal{C}_0(\overline{G} \times \overline{G}) \oplus \mathbb{R}. \tag{18}$$

The next lemma shows that both marginals of the probability measure ν_λ are equal to π.

Lemma 5.4. *For each* $w \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$,

$$\int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} w(x) d\nu_\lambda(x,y) = \int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} w(y) d\nu_\lambda(x,y) = \int_{\overline{G}} w(x) d\pi(x). \tag{19}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove (19) for non-negative functions $w \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ with $\sup_{x\in\overline{G}} w(x) \leq 1$. Let $\{f_n,\ n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of functions in $\mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ such that $0 \leq f_n \leq f_{n+1} \leq 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_n(x) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$ for each $x \in \overline{G}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$u_n(x,y) = f_n(y),\ v_n(x,y) = w(x) f_n(y),\ (x,y) \in \overline{G} \times \overline{G},$$

then $v_n,\ 1 - v_n \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G} \times \overline{G})$. Set $v(x,y) = w(x),\ (x,y) \in \overline{G} \times \overline{G}$. Since $(r_1, f_1, S_1) = (w, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(v)$ and $(r_2, f_2, S_2) = (1 - w, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(1 - v)$, by (17), linearity of Λ_λ, property (5) of Proposition 5.3 and the definition (14) of $Q_{\lambda+}$, we have

$$\Lambda_\lambda(v_n) \leq Q_{\lambda+}(v_n) \leq Q_{\lambda+}(v) \leq \int_{\overline{G}} w(x)\, d\pi(x) \tag{20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\lambda(1 - v_n) &= \Lambda_\lambda(1 - v) + \Lambda_\lambda(v(1 - u_n)) \\ &\leq Q_{\lambda+}(1 - v) + Q_{\lambda+}(1 - u_n) \\ &\leq \int_{\overline{G}} (1 - w(x))\, d\pi(x) + Q_{\lambda+}(1 - u_n). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The above two inequalities (20) and (21), together with (18) and the facts that $\Lambda_\lambda(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ and π is a probability measure, imply that

$$\int_{\overline{G}} w(x)\, d\pi(x) - Q_{\lambda+}(1 - u_n) \leq \int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} w(x) f_n(y) d\nu_\lambda(x,y) \leq \int_{\overline{G}} w(x)\, d\pi(x). \tag{22}$$

Since $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}, 1 - f_n) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(1 - u_n)$, by property (6) of Proposition 5.3 and the definition (14) of $Q_{\lambda+}$, we have

$$0 \leq Q_{\lambda+}(1 - u_n) \leq \int_{\overline{G}} (1 - f_n(x))\, d\pi(x).$$

Applying the dominated convergence theorem to the right-hand side of the above inequality, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Q_{\lambda+}(1 - u_n) = 0.$$

Then another application of the dominated convergence theorem to the middle term of (22) yields that

$$\int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} w(x) d\nu_\lambda(x,y) = \int_{\overline{G}} w(x)\, d\pi(x).$$

In an exactly analogous fashion, we can define

$$v(x,y) = w(y), \;\; v_n(x,y) = f_n(x)w(y), \;\; (x,y) \in \overline{G} \times \overline{G}, \;\; n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Using the facts that $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}, w) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(v)$ and $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}, 1-w) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(1-v)$, the same argument given above can then be used to establish the second equality in (19). This completes the proof of the lemma. ☐

Let $\{q_x^{\lambda,0}(dy), \; x \in \overline{G}\}$ be a regular conditional probability of ν_λ. For each bounded and measurable function g and $x \in \overline{G}$, define

$$\pi_\lambda^0(g)(x) \doteq \int_{\overline{G}} g(y) q_x^{\lambda,0}(dy). \tag{23}$$

Then for each $r \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{G})$ with $\inf_{x \in \overline{G}} r(x) \geq 0$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} r(x)g(y)d\nu_\lambda(x,y) \\ &\qquad = \int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} r(x)g(y)q_x^{\lambda,0}(dy)d\pi(x) \\ &\qquad = \int_{\overline{G}} r(x)\pi_\lambda^0(g)(x)d\pi(x). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

For every $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, substituting $w = g$ in (19) and $r = \mathbf{1}$ in (24), it follows that

$$\int\int_{\overline{G}\times\overline{G}} g(y)q_x^{\lambda,0}(dy)\pi(dx) = \int g(y)\pi(dy). \tag{25}$$

This shows that π would serve as a stationary distribution for any Markov chain with $q_x^{\lambda,0}$ as its transition kernel. However, in order to be able to show that the limit of the sequence of Markov chains, as $\lambda \to 0$, satisfies the submartingale problem, we will need to establish an additional inequality. As we show below, this will require us to modify the definition of $q_x^{\lambda,0}$ for x on a set of zero π-measure.

Let $r \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ with $\inf_{x\in\overline{G}} r(x) \geq 0$, $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, and $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $f(y) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f(y) \leq g(y)$ for all $y \in \overline{G}$. Defining $v(x,y) = r(x)g(y)$ for $(x,y) \in \overline{G}\times\overline{G}$, we see that $v \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G}\times\overline{G})$ and $(r, -f, \mathbf{0}) \in \Upsilon_\lambda(-v)$. Therefore, using first (24) and (18), next (17) and (15), and then the definition of $Q_{\lambda+}$ in (14), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\overline{G}} r(x)\pi_\lambda^0(g)(x)d\pi(x) = \Lambda_\lambda(v) \geq Q_{\lambda-}(v) \;\;&=\;\; -Q_{\lambda+}(-v) \\ &\geq\;\; \int_{\overline{G}} r(x)f(x)d\pi(x). \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We now show that the function r in (26) can be replaced by the indicator function of any bounded Borel measurable set.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose we are given $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $f(y) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f(y) \leq g(y)$ for all $y \in \overline{G}$. Then for each bounded Borel measurable set A,*

$$\int_{\overline{G}} \mathbb{1}_A(x)\pi_\lambda^0(g)(x)d\pi(x) \geq \int_{\overline{G}} \mathbb{1}_A(x)f(x)d\pi(x). \tag{27}$$

Proof. Fix a bounded Borel measurable set A. For the space $\overline{G}$ and the finite measure π, it follows from Lusin's theorem that there exists a sequence $\{r_n, \; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of continuous functions with compact support such that $\sup_{x\in\overline{G}} |r_n(x)| \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{1}_A(x) =$

$\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n(x)$ almost everywhere with respect to π. Since $1\!\!1_A$ is non-negative, we have $1\!\!1_A(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty}(r_n(x) \vee 0)$ almost everywhere with respect to π, where $r_n(\cdot) \vee 0$ is continuous and non-negative for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By (26), we have for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\int_{\overline{G}} (r_n(x) \vee 0)\pi^0_\lambda(g)(x)d\pi(x) \geq \int_{\overline{G}} (r_n(x) \vee 0)f(x)d\pi(x).$$

Thus, (27) follows from (26) and an application of the dominated convergence theorem. □

For each $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $y \in \overline{G}$, let

$$\kappa_\lambda(g)(y) \doteq \sup \left\{ \begin{array}{c} f(y) : -f \in \mathcal{H}, \text{ and for all } z \in \overline{G}, \\ f(z) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f(z) \leq g(z) \end{array} \right\}. \tag{28}$$

Lemma 5.6. *There exists a Borel measurable set U with $\pi(U) = 0$ such that for every $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$,*

$$\pi^0_\lambda(g)(y) \geq \kappa_\lambda(g)(y), \qquad y \in \overline{G} \setminus U. \tag{29}$$

Proof. To establish the lemma it suffices to show that for each $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$,

$$\int_{\overline{G}} 1\!\!1_A(y)\pi^0_\lambda(g)(y)d\pi(y) \geq \int_{\overline{G}} 1\!\!1_A(y)\kappa_\lambda(g)(y)d\pi(y) \tag{30}$$

for every measurable subset A of $\overline{G}$. Indeed, then fix a countable dense subset $\{g_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $\mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality (30) applied with $g = g_n$ implies that there exists a Borel measurable set U_{g_n} such that $\pi(U_{g_n}) = 0$ and $\pi^0_\lambda(g_n)(y) \geq \kappa_\lambda(g_n)(y)$ for all $y \in \overline{G} \setminus U_{g_n}$. If we set $U = \cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_{g_n}$, then $\pi(U) = 0$ and

$$\pi^0_\lambda(g_n)(y) \geq \kappa_\lambda(g_n)(y), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \overline{G} \setminus U. \tag{31}$$

We now extend this inequality to all $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ by a standard approximation argument. Fix $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $y \in \overline{G} \setminus U$. Since $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $\{g_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a countable dense set of $\mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, there exists a subsequence $\{g_{n_k}, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of $\{g_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $g_{n_k} \to g$ uniformly as $k \to \infty$. Let $\epsilon_k = \sup_{z\in\overline{G}} |g_{n_k}(z) - g(z)|$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f(z) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f(z) \leq g(z)$ for all $z \in \overline{G}$, and for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_k = f - \epsilon_k$. Then $-f_k \in \mathcal{H}$ and for each $z \in \overline{G}$,

$$f_k(z) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f_k(z) = f(z) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f(z) - \epsilon_k \leq g(z) - \epsilon_k \leq g_{n_k}(z).$$

Thus by (31) we have for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\pi^0_\lambda(g_{n_k})(y) \geq \kappa_\lambda(g_{n_k})(y) \geq f_k(y) = f(y) - \epsilon_k.$$

By taking the limit as $k \to \infty$ on both sides of the above inequality, we obtain (29).

It remains to show (30). Fix $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, and let m_g denote the supremum of g on $\overline{G}$. From (23), it is clear that $\pi^0_\lambda(g)(y) \leq m_g$ for each $y \in \overline{G}$. Suppose that (30) does not hold. Then there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a bounded Borel set $A \subseteq \overline{G}$ such that $\pi(A) > 0$ and for each $y \in A$,

$$\pi^0_\lambda(g)(y) \leq \kappa_\lambda(g)(y) - \varepsilon.$$

Let $M_{g,A}$ be the essential supremum of $\kappa_\lambda(g)$ on A under π. Then it follows from the definition of the essential supremum that

$$\pi(A \cap \{y \in \overline{G} : \kappa_\lambda(g)(y) > M_{g,A} - \varepsilon/4\}) > 0.$$

Notice that the definition of $\kappa_\lambda(g)$ implies that $\kappa_\lambda(g)$ is lower semicontinuous, and then the set $\{y \in \overline{G} : \kappa_\lambda(g)(y) > M_{g,A} - \varepsilon/4\}$ is an open set. Since any open set in $\mathbb{R}^J$ is the union of an increasing sequence of closed sets and A is bounded, then there exists a closed set D such that D is a subset of $\{y \in \overline{G} : \kappa_\lambda(g)(y) > M_{g,A} - \varepsilon/4\}$ and $\pi(A \cap D) > 0$. We claim that there exists $y \in D$ such that $\pi(A \cap B_r(y)) > 0$ for each $r > 0$. Indeed, suppose the claim does not hold. In other words, suppose that for every $y \in D$, there exists $r_y > 0$ such that $\pi(A \cap B_{r_y}(y)) = 0$. Then, since D is compact, by applying a finite cover argument, it follows that $\pi(A \cap D) = 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence, the claim holds. Now, choose $y \in D$ that satisfies the properties of the claim, and note that then $\kappa_\lambda(g)(y) > M_{g,A} - \varepsilon/4$. By the definition of $\kappa_\lambda(g)(y)$, there exists a function $f \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$ such that $-f \in \mathcal{H}$, $f(z) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f(z) \leq g(z)$ for all $z \in \overline{G}$ and $f(y) > \kappa_\lambda(g)(y) - \varepsilon/4$. Hence, it follows that $f(y) > M_{g,A} - \varepsilon/2$. By the continuity of f, there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that $f(z) \geq M_{g,A} - 3\varepsilon/4$ for all $z \in A \cap B_{r_1}(y)$. As a consequence, π-almost surely on $A \cap B_{r_1}(y)$,

$$\pi^0_\lambda(g)(z) \leq \kappa_\lambda(g)(z) - \varepsilon \leq M_{g,A} - \varepsilon \leq f(z) - \varepsilon/4.$$

Thus, we have

$$\int_{\overline{G}} 1\!\!1_{A \cap B_{r_1}(y)}(z) \pi^0_\lambda(g)(z) d\pi(z) \leq \int_{\overline{G}} 1\!\!1_{A \cap B_{r_1}(y)}(z)(f(z) - \varepsilon/4) d\pi(z).$$

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 5.5 that

$$\int_{\overline{G}} 1\!\!1_{A \cap B_{r_1}(y)}(z) \pi^0_\lambda(g)(z) d\pi(z) \geq \int_{\overline{G}} 1\!\!1_{A \cap B_{r_1}(y)}(z) f(z) d\pi(z).$$

But this contradicts the previous inequality since $\pi(A \cap B_{r_1}(y)) > 0$. This establishes (30) and the lemma follows. □

Let the measurable set U be as in Lemma 5.6, and define

$$q^\lambda_y(dz) \doteq q^{\lambda,0}_y(dz) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \pi_\lambda(g)(y) \doteq \pi^0_\lambda(g)(y), \qquad y \in \overline{G} \setminus U. \tag{32}$$

We shall now extend the definition of q^λ_y to y for all $y \in \overline{G}$ in such a way that the analogous inequality (29) holds on all of $\overline{G}$. Since the submartingale problem is well posed, let $\{\mathbb{Q}_z,\ z \in \overline{G}\}$ be the unique solution to the submartingale problem. For each $y \in U$, $t \geq 0$ and Borel set A, let $p(t, y, A) = \mathbb{Q}_y(\omega(t) \in A)$; thus, $p(t, y, \cdot)$ is the probability distribution of $\omega(t)$ under $\mathbb{Q}_y$. For $y \in U$ and Borel set A, define

$$q^\lambda_y(A) \doteq \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_0^\infty e^{-t/\lambda} p(t, y, A) dt \tag{33}$$

and for each $g \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^J)$, define

$$\pi_\lambda(g)(y) \doteq \int_{\overline{G}} g(z) q^\lambda_y(dz) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\overline{G}} e^{-t/\lambda} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}[g(\omega(t))]\, dt, \qquad y \in U, \tag{34}$$

where the second equality above follows from an application of Fubini's theorem.

Lemma 5.7. *For each $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $y \in \overline{G}$, $\pi_\lambda(g)(y) \geq \kappa_\lambda(g)(y)$.*

Proof. For each $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, let $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ be such that $f(z) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f(z) \leq g(z)$ for all $z \in \overline{G}$. It follows from property 2 of Definition 2.1 that

$$f(\omega(t)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L} f(\omega(u))\, du$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}_y$-submartingale on $(\mathcal{C}[0,\infty), \mathcal{M}, \{\mathcal{M}_t\})$, which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}\left[f(\omega(t)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\,du\right] \geq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}[f(\omega(0))] = f(y),$$

and hence, that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^\infty e^{-t/\lambda}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}\left[f(\omega(t)) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\,du\right] dt \geq f(y). \tag{35}$$

An application of Fubini's theorem shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^\infty e^{-t/\lambda}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}\left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\,du\right] dt \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}\left[\mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\right]\left(\int_u^\infty e^{-t/\lambda}\,dt\right) du \\
&\qquad = \int_0^\infty e^{-u/\lambda}\,\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_y}\left[\mathcal{L}f(\omega(u))\right] du.
\end{aligned}$$

When combined with (34) and (35) this implies that

$$\pi_\lambda(f - \lambda\mathcal{L}f)(y) \geq f(y), \qquad y \in U.$$

Taking the supremum over all f that satisfy $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f(z) - \lambda\mathcal{L}f(z) \leq g(z)$ for all $z \in \overline{G}$, we conclude that $\pi_\lambda(g)(y) \geq \kappa_\lambda(g)(y)$ for $y \in \overline{G} \setminus U$. Together with (32) and Lemma 5.6, this completes the proof. □

We are now in a position to construct the desired Markov chain. Let $\{X^\lambda(n\lambda), n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ be a discrete time Markov chain defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with transition kernel $q_x^\lambda(dy)$. Also, let

$$\mathcal{F}_n^\lambda \doteq \sigma(X^\lambda(j\lambda), j = 0, 1, \cdots, n), \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The next result shows that this Markov chain has the desired properties.

Proposition 5.8. *For each $\lambda > 0$, π is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain $\{X^\lambda(n\lambda), n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$. Moreover, for each $y \in \overline{G}$, $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$ such that $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g = f - \lambda\mathcal{L}f$,*

$$g(X^\lambda(n\lambda)) - g(X^\lambda(0)) - \lambda\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\mathcal{L}f(X^\lambda(j\lambda)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{36}$$

and

$$f(X^\lambda(n\lambda)) - f(X^\lambda(0)) - \lambda\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{L}f(X^\lambda(j\lambda)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{37}$$

are $\mathbb{P}$-submartingales with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_n^\lambda\}$.

Proof. For $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$, substituting $w = g$ in (19), $r = \mathbf{1}$ in (24), and using the relations $q_y^\lambda(dz) = q_y^{\lambda,0}(dz)$ for $y \in \overline{G} \setminus U$ and $\pi(U) = 0$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}^\pi[g(X^\lambda(\lambda))] = \mathbb{E}^\pi[g(X^\lambda(0)].$$

This shows that π is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain $\{X^\lambda(n\lambda), n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$.

To prove the second part of the lemma, fix $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\overline{G})$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$ such that $-f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $g = f - \lambda\mathcal{L}f$, and let I denote the identity map $I(g) = g$. Then, by the definition of π_λ given in (32), (23) and (34),

$$g(X^\lambda(n\lambda)) - g(X^\lambda(0)) - \lambda \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\lambda}(\pi_\lambda - I)(g)(X^\lambda(j\lambda)) \tag{38}$$

is a $\mathbb{P}$-martingale with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}^\lambda_n\}$. By Lemma 5.7, for each $z \in \overline{G}$, $\pi_\lambda(g)(z) \geq f(z)$, and hence $(\pi_\lambda - I)g(z) \geq \lambda\mathcal{L}f(z)$. This establishes the submartingale property for the process in (36). In turn, since $f = g + \mathcal{L}f$, this immediately implies the submartingale property for the process in (37). □

5.2. **Localization and Conditioning.** Let $\{X^\lambda(n\lambda), n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ be the Markov chain with transition kernel $\{q^\lambda_x(dy),\ x \in \overline{G}\}$ and initial distribution π as constructed in the last section, and let X^λ denote the continuous time extension obtained by linearly interpolating $\{X^\lambda(n\lambda), n \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ between time points $n\lambda$ and $(n+1)\lambda$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}^\lambda_t \doteq \sigma(X^\lambda(n\lambda), n \leq \lceil t \rceil),\ t \geq 0.$$

Note that, by construction, X^λ has continuous paths. Let $\{\lambda_m, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of positive decreasing real numbers such that $\lambda_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{Q}^m$ denote the probability measure on $(\mathcal{C}[0,\infty), \mathcal{M})$ induced by $X^{\lambda_m}(\cdot)$ when $X^{\lambda_m}(0)$ has distribution π. By (4), $\mathbb{Q}_\pi$ is the integral of $\mathbb{Q}_y$, the solution to the submartingale problem for a given initial condition y, with respect to the probability measure π. It will prove convenient to represent $\mathbb{Q}^m$ in a similar fashion. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty)$, let $\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}$ be a regular conditional probability distribution of $\mathbb{Q}^m$ given $\mathcal{M}_0$. Then, for each $\omega' \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}(\omega(0) = \omega'(0)) = 1. \tag{39}$$

Moreover, disintegrating $\mathbb{Q}^m$ and using the fact that the distribution of $\omega(0)$ under $\mathbb{Q}^m$ is π, we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}^m(\cdot) = \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}(\cdot)\mathbb{Q}^m(d\omega') = \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}(\cdot)\mathbb{P}^\pi(d\omega'), \tag{40}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^\pi$ is the probability measure on $(\mathcal{C}[0,\infty), \mathcal{M}_0)$ obtained as the restriction of $\mathbb{Q}^m$ to $\mathcal{M}_0$ defined as follows: for every $A_0 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^J)$,

$$\mathbb{P}^\pi(A) \doteq \pi(A_0 \cap \overline{G}), \qquad \text{if } A = \{\omega \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty) : \omega(0) \in A_0\}. \tag{41}$$

Since G may be unbounded, we now carry out a localization. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty)$, let

$$\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}(\omega) = \inf\left\{ t \geq 0 : \begin{array}{c} t = j\lambda_m \text{ for some } j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ and} \\ \omega(t) \notin B_N(0) \end{array} \right\}.$$

To ease the notation, for each $N, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}$ to denote the probability measure on $(\mathcal{C}[0,\infty), \mathcal{M})$ induced by $\omega(\cdot \wedge \kappa^{N,\lambda_m})$. Also, for each $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}$ be the law of $\omega(\cdot \wedge \kappa^{N,\lambda_m})$ under $\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}$. Then $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}\}$ is a regular conditional probability distribution of $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}$ given $\mathcal{M}_0$. Now, for each $N \geq 0$ recall the stopping time χ^N defined in (5). It is an immediate consequence of the definitions that for each $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\chi^N \leq \kappa^{N,\lambda_m}$ and hence,

$$\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}(A) = \mathbb{Q}^{m}_{\omega'}(A), \qquad A \in \mathcal{M}_{\chi^N}. \tag{42}$$

Moreover, analogous to (40), $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}$ satisfies the integral representation

$$\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}(\cdot) = \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}(\cdot)\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}(d\omega') = \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}(\cdot)\mathbb{P}^{\pi}(d\omega'). \tag{43}$$

We now state two main results and show that they imply Theorem 1. The first is a compactness result, which is proved in Section 5.3.2.

Proposition 5.9. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds. Then for each* $N \in \mathbb{N}$, *for each* $\omega' \in \mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)$, *the sequence of probability measures* $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *on the Polish space* $(\mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)\,, \mathcal{M})$, *equipped with the uniform topology on compact sets, is precompact.*

The second result is a characterization of limit points of the sequence, and is proved in Section 5.4.2.

Proposition 5.10. *Suppose Assumptions 2 holds. Then there exists* $F_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$ *with* $\mathbb{P}^{\pi}(F_0) = 0$ *such that for every* $N \in \mathbb{N}$ *large enough such that* $\mathcal{V} \subset B_N(0)$ *and each* $\omega' \notin F_0$, *any limit point* $\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$ *of the sequence* $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ *satisfies*

$$\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}(A) = \mathbb{Q}_{\omega'(0)}(A), \qquad A \in \mathcal{M}_{\chi^N}, \tag{44}$$

where for $z \in \overline{G}$, $\mathbb{Q}_z$ *is the unique solution to the submartingale problem with initial condition* z.

Proof of Theorem 1. To prove Theorem 1, it suffices to show that the inequality (2) is sufficient for π to be a stationary distribution for the unique solution to the associated submartingale problem. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 11.1.2 of [46] the stopping time χ^N is lower semicontinuous and, for every $\omega \in \mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)$, $\{\chi^N(\omega), N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a nondecreasing sequence that increases to ∞. Due to (42), Proposition 5.9 and Proposition 5.10, Lemma 11.1.1 of [46] (applied to $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}$, $\mathbb{Q}^{m}_{\omega'(0)}$ and χ^N, respectively, in place of $P^{n,k}$, P^n and τ^k in [46]) shows that for $\mathbb{P}^{\pi}$ almost every ω', as $m \to \infty$, $\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'} \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\omega'(0)}$. By the Portmanteau theorem, this implies that for $\mathbb{P}^{\pi}$ almost every ω' and every open set $A \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\liminf_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}(A) \geq \mathbb{Q}_{\omega'(0)}(A).$$

When combined with the representations (4) and (40) for $\mathbb{Q}_{\pi}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^m$, respectively, and Fatou's lemma, this implies that for every open set $A \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{Q}^m(A) &= \liminf_{m\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}(A)\mathbb{P}^{\pi}(d\omega') \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{Q}_{\omega'(0)}(A)\mathbb{P}^{\pi}(d\omega') \\ &= \int_{\overline{G}} \mathbb{Q}_z(A)\pi(dz) = \mathbb{Q}_{\pi}(A). \end{aligned}$$

Another application of the Portmanteau theorem then shows that, as $m \to \infty$, $\mathbb{Q}^m \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\pi}$.

Fix $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\overline{G})$. To show that π is a stationary distribution of the unique solution to the submartingale problem, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\pi}\left[f(\omega(t))\right] = \int_{\overline{G}} f(z)\pi(dz). \tag{45}$$

Since π is a stationary distribution for each Markov chain, it follows that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^m}\left[f(w(\lfloor t/\lambda_m \rfloor \lambda_m))\right] = \int_{\overline{G}} f(z)\pi(dz),$$

and the convergence $\mathbb{Q}^m \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_\pi$ established above implies

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_\pi}\left[f(w(t))\right] - \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^m}\left[f(w(t))\right] \right| = 0.$$

Thus, to establish (45), it suffices to show that for every $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^1(\overline{G})$,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^m}\left[\left|f(\omega(t)) - f(w(\lfloor t/\lambda_m \rfloor \lambda_m))\right|\right] = 0. \tag{46}$$

Now, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta > 0$ and $\rho > 0$, define

$$K_\rho^m \doteq \left\{ \omega : \sup_{s:|t-s|\le \lambda_m} |\omega(t) - \omega(s)| < \rho \right\}$$

and

$$K_{\rho,\delta} \doteq \left\{ \omega : \sup_{s:|t-s|\le \delta} |\omega(t) - \omega(s)| < \rho \right\}.$$

Then K_ρ^m, $K_{\rho,\delta}$ are two open sets in $\mathcal{M}$ and $K_{\rho,\delta} \subset K_\rho^m$ if $\lambda_m < \delta$. On the set K_ρ^m,

$$|f(\omega(t)) - f(w(\lfloor t/\lambda_m \rfloor \lambda_m))| \le ||f'||_\infty \rho.$$

On the other hand, the convergence $\mathbb{Q}^m \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_\pi$ and an application of the Portmanteau theorem show that

$$\limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{Q}^m(K_{\rho,\delta}^c) \le \mathbb{Q}_\pi(K_{\rho,\delta}^c).$$

Since $\mathbb{Q}_\pi$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{C}\,[0,\infty)$, then $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{Q}_\pi(K_{\rho,\delta}^c) = 0$. Putting these all together, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^m}\left[\left|f(\omega(t)) - f(w(\lfloor t/\lambda_m \rfloor \lambda_m))\right|\right] &\le \lim_{m\to\infty} 2||f||_\infty \mathbb{Q}^m((K_\rho^m)^c) + ||f'||_\infty \rho \\ &\le 2||f||_\infty \mathbb{Q}^m(K_{\rho,\delta}^c) + ||f'||_\infty \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Sending $\delta \downarrow 0$, then $\rho \downarrow 0$ we obtain (46) and, hence, (45), which proves that π is a stationary distribution for the submartingale problem. □

5.3. **Precompactness.** The proof of Proposition 5.9 is given in Section 5.3.2. It makes use of a general sufficient condition for the precompactness of a sequence of probability measures, which is first stated in Section 5.3.1.

5.3.1. *A Sufficient Condition for Precompactness.* For $\rho > 0$, let $\tau_0^m(\rho) \doteq 0$ and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\tau_n^m(\rho) \doteq \inf \left\{ \begin{array}{c} t \geq \tau_{n-1}^m(\rho) : \ t = j\lambda_m \text{ for some } j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ and} \\ |\omega(t) - \omega(\tau_{n-1}^m(\rho))| \geq \rho/4 \end{array} \right\}. \tag{47}$$

Lemma 5.11. *A sequence of probability measures $\{\mathbb{P}^m, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in the Prohorov topology on the Polish space $(\mathcal{C}[0,\infty), \mathcal{M})$ if the following conditions hold:*

1. *for any $\rho > 0$, $\delta = j\lambda_m$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,*
$$\mathbb{P}^m(\tau_{n+1}^m(\rho) - \tau_n^m(\rho) \leq \delta | \mathcal{M}_{\tau_n^m(\rho)}) \leq \delta A_{\rho/4}$$
$\mathbb{P}^m$ almost surely on $\{\tau_n^m(\rho) < \infty\}$, where $A_{\rho/4}$ is a constant depending only on ρ;
2. *for each $T > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*
$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{0 \leq j\lambda_m \leq T} \mathbb{P}^m(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \geq \varepsilon) = 0;$$
3. $$\lim_{l\to\infty} \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}^m(|\omega(0)| \geq l) = 0.$$

Proof. The lemma follows directly from Theorem 1.4.11 of [46]. Note that Theorem 1.4.11 of [46] contains the additional assumption that the hypotheses 1.4.8 and 1.4.9 (with $h = h_n$) and the choice of the constants A_f can be made independent of n. However, this assumption is used only to prove Lemma 1.4.10 of [46]. Here, we put the result of Lemma 1.4.10 therein as one of the conditions of the lemma. □

5.3.2. *Proof of Proposition 5.9.* Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$, let $f_{x,\varepsilon}$ be the function from the family defined in Assumption 1. The proof consists of three main claims.

Claim 1. For each $\omega' \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty)$, $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$,

$$f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(\lceil t/\lambda_m \rceil \lambda_m)) - f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(0)) - \lambda_m \sum_{j=1}^{\lceil t/\lambda_m \rceil \wedge (\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathcal{L} f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(j\lambda_m)) \tag{48}$$

is an integrable $\mathbb{Q}_{\omega'}^{N,m}$-supermartingale.

Proof of Claim 1. Fix $\omega' \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty)$, $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$. By the construction of $\{X^{\lambda_m}(i\lambda_m), \ i \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$, under $\mathbb{Q}^m$, $\{\omega(i\lambda_m), \ i \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is a Markov chain. Thus, $\{\omega(i\lambda_m), \ i \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}$ is still a Markov chain under $\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}$. It follows from (37) that for each $f \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$,

$$f(\omega(\lceil t/\lambda_m \rceil \lambda_m)) - f(\omega(0)) - \sum_{j=1}^{\lceil t/\lambda_m \rceil} \mathcal{L} f(\omega(j\lambda_m))\lambda_m \tag{49}$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}$-supermartingale. By property (1) of Assumption 1, $f_{x,\varepsilon}$ is a finite or countable sum of functions in $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$. Since $f_{x,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G})$, then (48) follows from (49), an application of L^1 convergence theorem for a sequence of supermartingales and an application of optional stopping theorem.

We now show that the sequence $\{\mathbb{Q}_{\omega'}^{N,m}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies all three conditions stated in Lemma 5.11, and hence is precompact.

Claim 2. $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies condition 1 of Lemma 5.11.

Proof of Claim 2. Fix $\rho > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ of the form $\delta = k\lambda_m$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, we recall the definition of the stopping time $\tau^m_n(\rho)$ given in (47), and let $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}\}$ and $\{\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega^*,n}\}$, respectively, denote regular conditional probability distributions of $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega'}$ given $\mathcal{M}_{\tau^m_n(\rho)}$. It is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega*,n}(A) = \mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega*,n}(A), \qquad A \in \mathcal{M}_{\tau^m_n(\rho)}.$$

Notice that $\{\omega(i\lambda_m),\ i \geq \tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*)/\lambda_m\}$ is a Markov chain under $\{\mathbb{Q}^m_{\omega^*,n}\}$. The same argument in proving *Claim 1*, together with the optional stopping theorem, shows that for each $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}(\tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega) = \tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*),\ \omega(t) = \omega^*(t),\ 0 \leq t \leq \tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega)) = 1, \tag{50}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho)+t)/\lambda_m\rceil\,\lambda_m)) - f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(\tau^m_n(\rho))) \\ & \qquad - \sum_{j=(\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho))/\lambda_m\rceil+1)\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)}^{\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho)+t)/\lambda_m\rceil\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathcal{L}f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(j\lambda_m))\lambda_m \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}$-supermartingale. Let $x^* = \omega^*(\tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*))$. If $x^* \in \overline{G} \setminus B_N(0)$, under $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}$, by the definition of κ^{N,λ_m}, $\omega(\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho)+t)/\lambda_m\rceil\,\lambda_m)$ is identically equal to x^* for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore, $\tau^m_{n+1}(\rho) = \infty$ and $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}(\tau^m(\rho) \leq \delta) = 0$, where

$$\tau^m(\rho) = \inf\left\{ \begin{array}{l} t \geq 0 : \tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*) + t = j\lambda_m \text{ for some } j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ and} \\ |\omega(\tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*) + t) - \omega(\tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*))| \geq \rho/4 \end{array} \right\}.$$

On the other hand, suppose that $x^* \in \overline{G} \cap B_N(0)$. Let $\varepsilon = \rho/24$. It is easy to see that $f_{x^*,\varepsilon}(x^*) = \mathcal{L}f_{x^*,\varepsilon}(x^*) = 0$. Applying the optional stopping theorem to the supermartingale in (51), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}}[f_{x^*,\varepsilon}(\omega(\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho)+\tau^m(\rho)\wedge\delta)/\lambda_m\rceil\,\lambda_m))] \\ & \quad \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}}\left[\sum_{j=(\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho))/\lambda_m\rceil+1)\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)}^{\lceil(\tau^m_n(\rho)+\tau^m(\rho)\wedge\delta)/\lambda_m\rceil\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathcal{L}f_{x^*,\varepsilon}(\omega(j\lambda_m))\lambda_m\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By property 3 of Assumption 1, there exists $C < \infty$ (depending only on N and ρ) such that

$$\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\mathcal{L}f_{x^*,\varepsilon}(y)| < C.$$

By property 2 of Assumption 1, there exists $c > 0$ (depending only on N and ρ) such that

$$f_{x^*,\varepsilon}(y) \geq c\mathbb{1}_{\{|y-x^*|>3\varepsilon\}}, \qquad \text{for all } y \in \overline{G}.$$

Moreover, on the set $\{\tau^m(\rho) \leq \delta\}$,

$$|\omega(\tau^m_n(\rho)(\omega^*) + \tau^m(\rho)) - x^*| \geq \rho/4 > 3\varepsilon.$$

Combining the last four displays, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} c\,\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}(\tau^m(\rho) \leq \delta) & \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,n}}\left[f_{x^*,\varepsilon}\left(\omega\left(\left\lceil\frac{\tau^m_n(\rho)+\tau^m(\rho)\wedge\delta}{\lambda_m}\right\rceil\lambda_m\right)\right)\right] \\ & \leq C\delta, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where the last inequality follows since δ is a multiple of λ_m. This shows that condition 1 of Lemma 5.11 holds with $A_{\rho/4} = C/c$, which is a constant depending only on ρ and N.

Claim 3. For each $T > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \sum_{0\le j\lambda_m \le T} \mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \ge \varepsilon) = 0.$$

Proof of Claim 3. For each $0 \le j\lambda_m \le T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \ge \varepsilon) \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}}\left[\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}\left(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \ge \varepsilon | \mathcal{M}_{j\lambda_m}\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By replacing $\tau^m(\rho)$ by $j\lambda_m$ in the argument in *Claim 2*, for a regular conditional probability distribution $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}\}$ of $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}$ given $\mathcal{M}_{j\lambda_m}$, we have that for each $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}(\omega(t) = \omega^*(t),\ 0 \le t \le j\lambda_m) = 1, \tag{53}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(\lceil (j\lambda_m + t)/\lambda_m \rceil \lambda_m)) - f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(j\lambda_m)) \\ &\qquad - \sum_{k=(j+1)\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)}^{\lceil (j\lambda_m+t)/\lambda_m\rceil \wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathcal{L}f_{x,\varepsilon}(\omega(k\lambda_m))\lambda_m \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}$-supermartingale. Let $y^* = \omega^*(j\lambda_m)$, $\varepsilon_{l_1} = \varepsilon/3$ and $\varepsilon_{l_2} = \varepsilon/24$, then $3\varepsilon_{l_2} < \varepsilon_{l_1}/2$. By an argument similar to that used to derive the first inequality in (52), there exists $c > 0$ (depending only on ε and N) such that

$$c\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \ge \varepsilon) \le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}}[f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_1}}(\omega((j+1)\lambda_m))]. \tag{55}$$

On the other hand, the supermartingale property in (54) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}}[f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_1}}(\omega((j+1)\lambda_m))] \le \lambda_m \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}}[\mathcal{L}f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_1}}(\omega((j+1)\lambda_m))]. \tag{56}$$

By property 2 of Assumption 1, $\mathcal{L}f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_1}}(y) = 0$ for $|y - y^*| \le \varepsilon_{l_1}/2$ and $f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_2}}(y) \ge c(N,\varepsilon_{l_2}) > 0$ for $|y - y^*| > 3\varepsilon_{l_2}$. When combined with property 3 of Assumption 1, it follows that there exists

$$K_N = \max\{C(N,\varepsilon_{l_1})/c(N,\varepsilon_{l_2}), C(N,\varepsilon_{l_2})\}$$

such that $|\mathcal{L}f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_1}}(y)| \le K_N f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_2}}(y)$ and $|\mathcal{L}f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_2}}(y)| \le K_N$ for every $y \in \overline{G}$. Together with (55) and (56), applied first with ε_{l_1} and then with ε_{l_2} in place of ε_{l_1}, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} c\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \ge \varepsilon) &\le \lambda_m K_N \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}}[f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_2}}(\omega((j+1)\lambda_m))] \\ &\le \lambda_m^2 K_N \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega^*,j}}[\mathcal{L}f_{y^*,\varepsilon_{l_2}}(\omega((j+1)\lambda_m))] \\ &\le \lambda_m^2 K_N^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\sum_{0\le j\lambda_m\le T} \mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}(|\omega((j+1)\lambda_m) - \omega(j\lambda_m)| \ge \varepsilon) \le TK_N^2\lambda_m/c,$$

which converges to zero as $m \to \infty$. This establishes condition 2 of Lemma 5.11.

Finally, (39) shows that condition 3 of Lemma 5.11 holds automatically. Thus, $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies all the conditions of Lemma 5.11 and therefore is precompact.

5.4. **Convergence of the Approximating Sequence.**

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 5.10. That any weak limit of $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies the first two properties of the submartingale problem will be deduced primarily from results already obtained in Section 5.3. The verification of the third property relies on some preliminary estimates that are first established in Section 5.4.1, and the proof is completed in Section 5.4.2.

5.4.1. *Preliminary Estimates.*

Lemma 5.12. *There exists a set $F_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$ with $\mathbb{P}^\pi(F_0) = 0$ such that for each $\omega' \in \mathcal{C}[0,\infty) \setminus F_0$,*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_m \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil t/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil \wedge (\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\frac{1}{m}}(\partial G)}\left(\omega\left(j\lambda_m\right)\right)\right] = 0. \tag{57}$$

Proof. Since π is a stationary distribution for each Markov chain, the distribution of $\omega(j\lambda_m)$ under $\mathbb{Q}^m$ is equal to π for every $j, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Together with (43) and (44) this implies that for each $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{m\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{C}[0,\infty)} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_m \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil t/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil \wedge (\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\frac{1}{m}}(\partial G)}\left(\omega\left(j\lambda_{m_k}\right)\right)\right] \mathbb{P}^\pi(d\omega') \\
&= \limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m}}\left[\lambda_m \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil t/\lambda_m\rceil \wedge (\kappa^{N,\lambda_m}/\lambda_m)} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\frac{1}{m}}(\partial G)}\left(\omega\left(j\lambda_m\right)\right)\right] \\
&\leq \limsup_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{m}}\left[\lambda_m \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil t/\lambda_m\rceil} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\frac{1}{m}}(\partial G)}\left(\omega\left(j\lambda_m\right)\right)\right] \\
&\leq t \lim_{m\to\infty} \int_{\partial G} \mathbb{1}_{B_{\frac{1}{m}}(\partial G)}(z)\, \pi(dz) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the assumption that $\pi(\partial G) = 0$. Since the integrand in the first term above is nonnegative, this completes the proof of the lemma. □

The following family of test functions will be used in the proof of Theorem 1. The proof relies on Assumption 2 and is purely analytic, and hence is relegated to Appendix D.

Lemma 5.13. *Suppose Assumption 2 holds. For $x \in \mathcal{V}$, let $v_x \neq 0$ be the unit vector stated in Assumption 2 and let $h(y) \doteq \langle v_x, y - x\rangle$ on $\overline{G}$. Then for each $x \in \mathcal{V}$, there exist constants $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$, there exists a non-negative function $g_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ with $-g_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that*

1. $\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y) \le C\varepsilon$;
2. $\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\nabla g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)| \le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$;
3. $\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\langle b(y), \nabla g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)\rangle| \le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$;
4. *for each* $y \in \overline{G}\cap B_{r_x}(x)$,
    - (a) $\sum_{i,j=1}^J a_{ij}(y)\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i\partial x_j} \ge c$ *if* $\delta + 2\sqrt{\delta} < h(y) < \varepsilon/2$,
    - (b) $\left|\sum_{i,j=1}^J a_{ij}(y)\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\right| \le C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ *if* $h(y) \ge \varepsilon$;
    - (c) $\sum_{i,j=1}^J a_{ij}(y)\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i\partial x_j} \ge 0$ *otherwise.*

5.4.2. *Proof of Proposition 5.10.* Let F_0 be as in Lemma 5.12. Fix $\omega' \notin F_0$, and let $\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$ be a weak limit of a convergent subsequence $\{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}, k\in\mathbb{N}\}$ in $\{Q^{N,m}_{\omega'}, m\in\mathbb{N}\}$. It suffices to show that $\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$ satisfies the three properties of the submartingale problem stopped at χ^N with initial condition $\omega'(0)$ (see Definition 2.4). The first property follows directly from (39). Also, by Proposition 5.8, for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, for every $f\in\mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$ such that $-f\in\mathcal{H}$,

$$f(\omega(\lceil t/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil \lambda_{m_k})) - \lambda_{m_k} \sum_{l=1}^{\left\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\right\rceil} \mathcal{L}f(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})) \tag{58}$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}$-submartingale. Since $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'} \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$, a standard convergence argument together with an application of the optional stopping theorem shows that for every $f\in\mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$ such that $-f\in\mathcal{H}$,

$$f(\omega(t\wedge\chi^N)) - \int_0^{t\wedge\chi^N} \mathcal{L}f(\omega(s))\,ds$$

is a $\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$-submartingale, which establishes the second property of the local submartingale problem.

We now turn to the proof of the third property. Fix $x\in\mathcal{V}$. Let the constants C, c, the function h and, for each $\varepsilon>0$ sufficiently small and $\delta\in(0,\varepsilon)$, the function $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ be the associated quantities from Lemma 5.13. Since $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is a nonnegative function that lies in $\mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$, Proposition 5.8, with f replaced by $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$, and property 1 of Lemma 5.13 show that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}&\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\left\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\right\rceil}\mathcal{L}g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\right]\\ &\le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega(\lceil t/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil\lambda_{m_k}))\right] - g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega'(0)) \le C\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the definition of the operator $\mathcal{L}$ in (1), and then using property 2 of Lemma 5.13, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil}\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\right]\\
&\quad\le 2C\varepsilon-2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil}\langle b(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})),\nabla g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\rangle\right]\\
&\quad\le 2C\varepsilon+2C\sqrt{\varepsilon}(t+\lambda_{m_k}).
\end{aligned}\tag{59}$$

For each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, using properties 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c) of Lemma 5.13 and then (59), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&c\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil}\mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\mathbb{1}_{(\delta+2\sqrt{\delta},\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})))\right]\\
\le\ &\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}}_{\omega'}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil}\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\mathbb{1}_{(0,\varepsilon)}(h(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})))\right]\\
\le\ &\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}}_{\omega'}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil}\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\right]\\
&\quad+C\sqrt{\varepsilon}(t+\lambda_{m_k})\\
\le\ &2C\varepsilon+3C\sqrt{\varepsilon}(t+\lambda_{m_k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking limits as $\delta\downarrow 0$ in the last display, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}}_{\omega'}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil}\mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\mathbb{1}_{(0,\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})))\right]\\
&\quad\le\frac{C}{c}\left(2\varepsilon+3\sqrt{\varepsilon}(t+\lambda_{m_k})\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since, on $B_{r_x}(x)$, $h(y)=0$ if and only if $y=x$ and $x\in\mathcal{V}\subset\partial G$, combining the above inequality with Lemma 5.12 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k})}\mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})))\right]\\
&\quad\le\frac{C}{c}\left(2\varepsilon+3\sqrt{\varepsilon}t\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m))\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m)))ds\right] \\
&\quad\le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\int_0^{t\wedge\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}} \mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m))\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m)))ds\right] \\
&\quad\le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\lambda_{m_k}\sum_{l=1}^{\lceil t/\lambda_{m_k}\rceil\wedge(\kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}/\lambda_{m_k})} \mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k}))\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(l\lambda_{m_k})))\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that under $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}$, $h(\omega(t)) > \varepsilon/2$ when $t \ge \kappa^{N,\lambda_{m_k}}$ and $\omega(t) \in B_{r_x}(x)$ and the second inequality follows the fact that the integrand is non-negative. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R})$ be such that $0 \le f \le \mathbb{1}_{(-\varepsilon/2,\varepsilon/2)}$ and $f(0) = 1$ and let $g \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^J)$ be such that $0 \le g \le \mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}}$ and $g(x) = 1$. Since h is non-negative, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\int_0^t (gf)(h(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m)))ds\right] \\
&\quad\le \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'}}\left[\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{B_{r_x}(x)}(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m))\mathbb{1}_{[0,\varepsilon/2)}(h(\omega(\lceil s/\lambda_m\rceil\lambda_m)))ds\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\mathbb{Q}^{N,m_k}_{\omega'} \Rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$ as $k \to \infty$, by applying the Skorokhod representation theorem and Lemma A.4 of [30] to the left-hand side of the above inequality and using the fact that $h(y) = 0$ if and only if $y = x$ and $y \in B_{r_x}(x)$, we conclude that

$$
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}}\left[\int_0^{t\wedge\chi^N} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}(\omega(s))\,ds\right] \le \frac{1}{c}\left(2C\varepsilon + 2C\sqrt{\varepsilon}t\right).
$$

Sending first $\varepsilon \to 0$ on the right-hand side of the above inequality and then $t \to \infty$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}}\left[\int_0^{\chi^N} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}(\omega(s))\,ds\right] = 0.
$$

Because there are only a finite number of $x \in \mathcal{V}$, summing the above over $x \in \mathcal{V}$ shows that $\mathbb{Q}^{N,*}_{\omega'}$ also satisfies the third property in Definition 2.4 with initial condition $z = \omega'(0)$. Since, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the unique solution χ^N_z to the local submartingale problem stopped at χ^N coincides on $\mathcal{M}_{\chi^N}$ with the unique solution $\mathbb{Q}_z$ to the submartingale problem with the same initial condition, this completes the proof of the proposition. □

6. Proof of Theorem 2

Since Assumption 2 follows directly from Assumption 2', the proof of Theorem 2 essentially reduces to the construction of a test function that satisfies Assumption 1. This construction involves patching together certain local test functions, whose existence is first established in Proposition 6.1. The proof of Proposition 6.1 is purely analytic, and is thus relegated to Appendix A.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose $(G, d(\cdot))$ is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection and $\mathcal{V} \subset \partial G$ satisfies Assumption 2'. Then for every $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a nonnegative function $g^\varepsilon_x \in \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$ such that*

(1) $\operatorname{supp}[g_x^\varepsilon] \cap \overline{G} \subseteq B_\varepsilon(x) \cap \overline{G}$;

(2) *there exists an open neighbourhood* $\mathcal{O}_{x,\varepsilon}$ *of* x *such that*

$$g_x^\varepsilon(y) > \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{O}_{x,\varepsilon}.;$$

(3) *there exists a constant* $A(x,\varepsilon) > 0$ *such that*

$$\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |g_x^\varepsilon(y)| \leq A(x,\varepsilon), \ \sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\nabla g_x^\varepsilon(y)| \leq A(x,\varepsilon), \ \sup_{y\in\overline{G}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} \left| \frac{\partial^2 g_x^\varepsilon(y)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \right| < A(x,\varepsilon).$$

Moreover, when $(G, d(\cdot))$ *is a polyhedral domain with piecewise constant reflection, for every* $\delta > 0$ *there exists an open neighborhood* $\mathcal{O}_{\emptyset,\delta,\varepsilon}$ *and a constant* $A(\emptyset,\delta,\varepsilon)$ *such that* $\mathcal{O}_{x,\varepsilon} = \mathcal{O}_{\emptyset,\delta,\varepsilon}$ *and* $A(x,\varepsilon) = A(\emptyset,\delta,\varepsilon)$ *for each* $x \in G \setminus N_\delta(\partial G)$ *and for every* $x \in \partial G \setminus N_\delta(\mathcal{V} \cup \cup_{i \notin \mathcal{I}(x)}(\partial G \cap \partial G_i))$*, there exists a finite collection of open neighborhoods and constants* $\{\mathcal{O}_{F,\delta,\varepsilon},\ A(F,\delta,\varepsilon) :\ F \in \{\mathcal{I}(z) :\ z \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}\}\}$ *such that* $\mathcal{O}_{x,\varepsilon} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{I}(x),\delta,\varepsilon}$ *and* $A(x,\varepsilon) = A(\mathcal{I}(x),\delta,\varepsilon)$.

We now use Proposition 6.1 to prove Theorem 2. Suppose first that $(G, d(\cdot))$ is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection and G is bounded. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let the family of functions g_x^ε and associated sets $\mathcal{O}_{x,\varepsilon}$, $x \in \overline{G}$, be as in Proposition 6.1. For each $z \in \overline{G}$, the set $\overline{G} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J :\ |x - z| \geq 2\varepsilon\}$ is compact. Therefore there exists a finite set

$$S_z = \{x_j \in \overline{G}, |x_j - z| \geq 2\varepsilon, j = 1, \cdots, l\}$$

such that

$$\cup_{x_j \in S_z} \mathcal{O}_{x_j,\varepsilon} \supset \overline{G} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J :\ |x - z| \geq 2\varepsilon\}. \tag{60}$$

Now, for each $z \in \overline{G}$, define

$$h_z^\varepsilon(y) = \sum_{x_j \in S_z} g_{x_j}^\varepsilon(y), \qquad y \in \overline{G}. \tag{61}$$

Now, since $\overline{G} \cap B_N(0)$ is compact, there exists a finite cover of $\overline{G} \cap B_N(0)$ of the form $\{B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_k), z_k \in \overline{G} \cap B_N(0), k = 1, \cdots, m_N\}$. For each $x \in \overline{G} \cap B_N(0)$, if x is contained in $B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_k)$ for only one k, then define $f_{x,\varepsilon} = h_{z_k}^\varepsilon$, and if x is contained in $B_{\varepsilon/2}(z_k)$ for more than one k, define $f_{x,\varepsilon} = h_{z_{k^*}}^\varepsilon$ where k^* is the smallest index among those k's.

We now verify that the functions $\{f_{x,\varepsilon}, x \in \overline{G} \cap B_N(0), \varepsilon > 0\}$ satisfy the properties stated in Assumption 1. Since each g_x^ε lies in $\mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$ by Proposition 6.1, it follows that each h_z^ε, and therefore each $f_{x,\varepsilon}$, is a finite sum of functions in $\mathcal{H}$, and the first property follows. Now, fix $x \in \overline{G} \cap B_N(0)$ and let z_k be such that $|z_k - x| < \varepsilon/2$ and $f_{x,\varepsilon} = h_{z_k}^\varepsilon$. Note that $|y - x| > 3\varepsilon$ implies $|y - z_k| > 2\varepsilon$, which in turn implies that $y \in \cup_{x_j \in S_{z_k}^N} \mathcal{O}_{x_j,\varepsilon}$ due to (60). The definition (61) of $h_{z_k}^\varepsilon$, the fact that each $g_{x_j}^\varepsilon$ is nonnegative and property 2 of Proposition 6.1 then imply that $h_{z_k}^\varepsilon(y) > 1/2$. On the other hand, suppose $|y - x| < \varepsilon/2$. Then $|y - z_k| < \varepsilon$. However, the inequalities $|x_j - z_k| > 2\varepsilon$ and $\operatorname{supp}[g_{x_j}] \subset B_\varepsilon(x)$ (with the latter inequality resulting from property 1 of Proposition 6.1) for all $x_j \in S_{z_k}^N$ imply that $h_{z_k}(y) = 0$ for $|y - z_k| < \varepsilon$. Thus, we have shown that $f_{x,\varepsilon}$ satisfies property 2 of Assumption 1. Lastly, since each $g_x^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$ and b and σ are continuous, there exists $C_{x,\varepsilon} < \infty$ such that $|\mathcal{L} g_x^\varepsilon(y)| \leq C_{x,\varepsilon}$ for every $y \in \overline{G}$. Thus, if we set $C(N,\varepsilon) \doteq \max_{k=1,\ldots,m_N} \sum_{x \in S_{z_k}} C_{x,\varepsilon}$, it is clear that $f_{x,\varepsilon}$ satisfies property 3 of Assumption 1. This completes the proof of Theorem 2 for the case of a bounded domain.

Next, suppose that $(G, d(\cdot))$ is a polyhedral domain with piecewise constant reflection. Since G is a polyhedron and the set $\mathcal{V}$ is finite, it follows from the second part of Proposition 6.1 that there exist a constant integer $m(z,\varepsilon) > 0$, a constant $C_{z,\varepsilon} < \infty$ and a countable set

$$S_z = \{x_j \in \overline{G} : |x_j - z| \geq 2\varepsilon, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

such that

$$\cup_{x_j \in S_z} \mathcal{O}_{x_j,\varepsilon} \supset \overline{G} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J : \ |x - z| \geq 2\varepsilon\}, \tag{62}$$

for each $x \in \overline{G}$ such that $|x-z| \geq 2\varepsilon$, there are at most $m(z,\varepsilon)$ open sets in $\{\mathcal{O}_{x_j,\varepsilon} : \ x_j \in S_z\}$ that contain x, and $\sup_{x_j \in S_z} |\mathcal{L} g^{\varepsilon}_{x_j}(y)| \leq C_{z,\varepsilon}$ for every $y \in \overline{G}$. Thus, we can define the function h^{ε}_z as in (61) for each $z \in \overline{G}$ and follow the previous argument for the case when $(G, d(\cdot))$ is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection and G is bounded to complete the proof of Theorem 2 with $c(N,\varepsilon) = 1/2$ and $C(N,\varepsilon) \doteq \max_{k=1,\ldots,m_N} m(z_k,\varepsilon) C_{z_k,\varepsilon}$. □

Appendix A. Construction of Local Test Functions

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 6.1. Consider $(G, d(\cdot))$ that are piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection. We first construct a family of test functions $g_{x,r}$, for $x \in \overline{G}$ and sufficiently small $r > 0$. The nature of the construction is different for the cases $x \in G$, $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$ or $x \in \mathcal{V}$, and is presented below in Propositions A.1, A.4 and A.6, respectively. The proof of Proposition 6.1 is given at the end of the section.

Proposition A.1. *For each $x \in G$, there is a constant $A_x < \infty$ such that for every $r \in (0, r_x)$, where $r_x \doteq (\text{dist}(x, \partial G))^2$, there exists a nonnegative function $g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G})$ such that*

1. *$supp[g_{x,r}] \cap \overline{G} \subset B_{\sqrt{r}}(x) \subset G$;*
2. *$0 \leq g_{x,r}(y) \leq 1$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^J$ and $g_{x,r}(y) = 1$ for each $y \in B_{\sqrt{r}/2}(x)$;*
3. *the following bounds are satisfied:*

$$\sup_{y \in \overline{G}} |g_{x,r}(y)| \leq A_x, \ \sup_{y \in \overline{G}} |\nabla g_{x,r}(y)| \leq \frac{A_x}{r}, \ \sup_{y \in \overline{G}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} \left| \frac{\partial^2 g_{x,r}(y)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \right| < \frac{A_x}{r^2};$$

Proof. Let ξ be a bounded $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi(z) = 1$ when $z \leq 1/2$, $\xi(z) = 0$ when $z > 1$, and ξ is strictly decreasing in the interval $(1/2, 1)$, and note that then $\|\xi'\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\|\xi''\|_\infty < \infty$. For each $x \in G$ and $0 < r < r_x$, define $g_{x,r}(y) \doteq \xi(|y - x|^2/r)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^J$. The three properties of $g_{x,r}$ are then easily verified. The first inclusion in the first property holds because $|x-y|^2/r > 1$ when $y \notin B_{\sqrt{r}}(x)$ and $\xi(z) = 0$ when $z > 1$, whereas the second inclusion holds because $\sqrt{r} < \sqrt{r_x} = \text{dist}(x, \partial G)$. The second property is satisfied because $y \in B_{\sqrt{r}/2}(x)$ implies $(y-x)^2/r \leq 1/4$, and $\xi(z) = 1$ for $z \leq 1/4$, and the last property holds with $A_x \doteq \max(1, 2\|\xi'\|_\infty \text{dist}(x, \partial G), (4(J^2 - J)\|\xi''\|_\infty + 2J\|\xi'\|_\infty) (\text{dist}(x, \partial G))^2)$. □

Remark A.2. The function $g_{x,r}$ in Proposition A.1 is translation invariant in G in the sense that $g_{x,r}(y) = g_{x+\delta,r}(y + \delta)$ for each $y \in B_{\sqrt{r}}(x)$ and $r < r_x \wedge r_{x+\delta}$.

We now paraphrase a result from [35] that will be used to construct local functions associated with points $x \in \partial G$.

Lemma A.3. *Let $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ be a closed convex cone with vertex at the origin and a boundary that is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$, except possibly at the vertex. Given any closed, convex, compact subset $\mathcal{K}$ of the interior of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$, constants $0 < \eta < \lambda < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function ℓ on the set*

$$\Lambda \doteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \eta < \operatorname{dist}(y, \overline{\mathcal{C}}) < \lambda\}$$

that satisfies the following properties:

1. $\sup_{z\in\Lambda} \left(\left|\ell(z) - \operatorname{dist}(z, \overline{\mathcal{C}})\right| \vee |\nabla\ell(z) - 1|\right) \leq \varepsilon$;
2. *for every* $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, J\}$, $\sup_{z\in\Lambda} \left|\frac{\partial^2 \ell(z)}{\partial z_j \partial z_k}\right| < \frac{3}{\eta} + 1$.
3. *there exists* $\theta > 0$ *such that*

$$\langle \nabla\ell(z), p\rangle \leq -\theta, \qquad \textit{for } p \in \mathcal{K} \textit{ and } z \in \Lambda.$$

On the other hand, if $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a half-space so that its boundary is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ everywhere, given any subset $\mathcal{K}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$, the function $\ell(x) \doteq \operatorname{dist}(x, \overline{\mathcal{C}})$, $x \in \Lambda$, is a $\mathcal{C}^2$ function on Λ that satisfies properties (1) and (2) above and property (3) with $\theta = 0$.

As shown in [35], a function ℓ with the properties stated above can be constructed as a suitable mollification of the distance function to the cone $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Indeed, Lemma A.3 follows immediately from the proof of Lemma 6.2 of [35], with g_C, L_{C,δ_C}, $K_C^{\delta_C/3}$, $\tilde{\eta}_C$, $\tilde{\lambda}_C$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_C$ therein replaced by $l(\cdot)$, $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$, $\mathcal{K}$, η, λ and ε, respectively.

We now construct the second class of test functions associated with $x \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proposition A.4. *Suppose Assumption 2' holds with unit vector v_x and associated constants $r_x > 0$, $0 < c_x^1 < c_x^2 < \infty$, $\alpha_x > 0$, $x \in \mathcal{V}$. For each $x \in \mathcal{V}$ there is a constant $A_x < \infty$ such that for every $r \in (0, r_x/c_x^2)$, there exists a nonnegative function $g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$ such that the following three properties hold:*

1. $\operatorname{supp}[g_{x,r}] \cap \overline{G} \subset \overline{B}_{c_x^2 r}(x) \cap \overline{G} \subset B_{r_x}(x) \cap \overline{G}$;
2. $g_{x,r}(y) = 1$ *for each* $y \in B_{c_x^1 r}(x) \cap \overline{G}$;
3. *the following bounds are satisfied:*

$$\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |g_{x,r}(y)| \leq A_x, \ \sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\nabla g_{x,r}(y)| \leq \frac{A_x}{r}, \ \sup_{y\in\overline{G}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} \left|\frac{\partial^2 g_{x,r}(y)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}\right| < \frac{A_x}{r^2}.$$

4. $\langle d, \nabla g_{x,r}(y)\rangle \leq 0$ *for* $d \in d(y)$ *and* $y \in \partial G$.

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathcal{V}$ and $r \in (0, r_x/c_x^2)$. By (9) of Assumption 2', we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{y\in\overline{G}\cap B_{r_x}(x)} \operatorname{dist}(y, x + rv_x + \Theta_x) &= \sup_{y\in\overline{G}\cap B_{c_x^2 r}(x)} \operatorname{dist}(y, x + rv_x + \Theta_x) \\ &\leq \sup_{y\in\overline{G}\cap B_{c_x^2 r}(x)} |y - x - rv_x| \leq (c_x^2 + 1)r. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

We first argue by contradiction to establish the claim that the quantity

$$\kappa_x \doteq \inf_{r\in(0,r_x/c_x^2)} \ \inf_{y\in\overline{G}:\ |y-x|/r\leq c_x^1} \operatorname{dist}((y - x)/r, v_x + \Theta_x)$$

is strictly positive. Suppose, instead, that $\kappa_x = 0$. Then there exists a sequence $\{(y_m, r_m) :\ m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $r_m \in (0, r_x/c_x^2)$, $y_m \in \overline{G}$, $|y_m - x|/r_m \leq c_x^1$

and $\text{dist}((y_m - x)/r_m, v_x + \Theta_x) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Since $(y_m - x)/r_m$ is bounded by c_x^1 uniformly in m, by choosing a subsequence if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that there exists y^* such that $|y^*| \leq c_x^1$ and $(y_m - x)/r_m \to y^*$ as $m \to \infty$. This implies that $\text{dist}(y^*, v_x + \Theta_x) = 0$ or, in other words, that $y^* = v_x + z^*$ for some $z^* \in \Theta_x$. Thus, since v_x is a unit vector and $z^* \in \Theta_x$ implies $\langle v_x, z^* \rangle \geq 0$,

$$|y^*|^2 = \langle v_x + z^*, v_x + z^* \rangle = 1 + 2 \langle v_x, z^* \rangle + |z^*|^2 \geq 1.$$

But this contradicts the inequalities $|y^*| \leq c_x^1 < 1$. Thus, we have shown that $\kappa_x > 0$. Since Θ_x is a half-plane that goes through the origin, this implies that

$$\text{dist}(y, x + rv_x + \Theta_x) \geq \kappa_x r \text{ for each } y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{c_x^1 r}(x). \tag{64}$$

Consider the set

$$\Lambda_x \doteq \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^J : \frac{\kappa_x}{32} < \text{dist}(z, \Theta_x) < \overline{c}_x + 3 \right\},$$

and define $\ell_x(z) \doteq \text{dist}(z, \Theta_x)$ for $z \in \Lambda_x$. Then, since Θ_x is a half-space and property 2 of Assumption 2' shows that $\cup_{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)} d(y) \subseteq \Theta_x$, it follows from Lemma A.3 that ℓ_x satisfies properties (1)–(3) therein with $\Lambda = \Lambda_x$, $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \Theta_x$, $\mathcal{K} = \cup_{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)} d(y)$, $\eta = \kappa_x/32$, $\lambda = c_x^2 + 3$, $\varepsilon = \kappa_x/64$ and $\theta = 0$. Now, let ζ be a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ function defined on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\zeta(s) = 0$ when $s < 1/2$, $\zeta(s) = 1$ when $s > 1$, and ζ is strictly increasing in the interval $(1/2, 1)$. Then, for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^J$, define

$$g_{x,r}(y) \doteq \begin{cases} \zeta\left(\frac{2}{\kappa_x} \ell_x\left(\frac{y - x - rv_x}{r}\right)\right) & \text{if } \frac{y - x - rv_x}{r} \in \Lambda_x \text{ and } y \in B_{r_x}(x), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The first property of ℓ_x from Lemma A.3 and the definition of ζ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}[g_{x,r}] \cap \overline{G} &\subseteq \{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x) : \ l_x\left(\tfrac{y - x - rv_x}{r}\right) > \tfrac{\kappa_x}{4}\} \\ &\subseteq \{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x) : \ \text{dist}(y, x + rv_x + \Theta_x) > \tfrac{\kappa_x r}{8}\}. \end{aligned}$$

However, by the property (9) of c_x^2 stated in Assumption 2' and the fact that $rc_x^2 < r_x$, it follows that

$$\{y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x) : \ \text{dist}(y, x + rv_x + \Theta_x) > \kappa_x r/8\} \subset \overline{G} \cap B_{c_x^2 r}(x).$$

The last two assertions and (63) together imply that $\text{supp}[g_{x,r}] \cap \overline{G} \subset \Lambda_x$. This and the fact that $\zeta \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $\ell_x \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Lambda_x)$ imply that $g_{x,r}$ is $\mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^J)$. The last two assertions also imply that $g_{x,r}$ satisfies the first property stated in the proposition. Next, for $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{c_x^1 r}(x)$, by (64) it follows that $\text{dist}(\frac{y - x - rv_x}{r}, \Theta_x) \geq \kappa_x$, and by the first property of ℓ_x from Lemma A.3, we have $\ell_x(\frac{y - x - rv_x}{r}) \geq 63\kappa_x/64$, which in turn implies $\zeta\left(\frac{2}{\kappa_x} \ell_x\left(\frac{y - x - rv_x}{r}\right)\right) = 1$. Thus, $g_{x,r}(y) = 1$ for all $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{c_x^1 r}(x)$, showing that the second property holds. The third property is easily verified using the form of $g_{x,r}$, the fact that $g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\overline{G})$. Finally, the fourth property of $g_{x,r}$ holds because ℓ satisfies the third property of Lemma A.3 with $\theta = 0$, and ζ is non-decreasing. □

We now turn to the construction of local test functions associated with $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$. For this, we first introduce some geometric objects associated with the directions of reflection, similar to those introduced in Section 6.1 of [35] in the context of polyhedral domains. For $x \in \partial G$, let

$$K_x \doteq \left\{ - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} a_i \gamma^i(x) : a_i \geq 0, i \in \mathcal{I}(x), \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} a_i = 1 \right\}. \tag{65}$$

Note that K_x is a convex, compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^J$. Therefore, there exist $\delta_x > 0$ and a compact, convex set K_{x,δ_x} such that K_{x,δ_x} has $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ boundary and satisfies

$$K_x^{\delta_x/2} \subset (K_{x,\delta_x})^\circ \subset K_{x,\delta_x} \subset K_x^{\delta_x}, \tag{66}$$

where we recall that K_x^ε denotes the ε-fattening of the set K_x for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Now, if $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$, then it is easy to see that $0 \notin K_x$ and

$$\min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d \rangle < 0 \qquad \text{for every } d \in K_x. \tag{67}$$

Therefore, $\delta_x > 0$ can be chosen such that $0 \notin K_{x,\delta_x}$ and

$$\min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d \rangle < 0 \qquad \text{for every } d \in K_x^{\delta_x}, \tag{68}$$

We first establish an elementary result that will be used in the construction.

Lemma A.5. *For $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$, there exist $R_x \in (0,1)$ and $\beta_x > 0$ such that*

$$\min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d \rangle < -2\beta_x |d| \qquad \textit{for every } d \in \cup_{t \in [0,R_x]} t K_{x,\delta_x} \tag{69}$$

and

$$\left(x + \cup_{t \in [0,R_x]} t K_{x,\delta_x} \right) \cap \overline{G} = \{x\}. \tag{70}$$

Moreover, if $n^i(\cdot)$ and $\gamma^i(\cdot)$ are constant vector fields for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, then R_x and δ_x depend on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$.

Proof. We first use an argument by contradiction to prove that

$$\sup_{d \in K_{x,\delta_x}} \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d/|d| \rangle < 0. \tag{71}$$

Suppose (71) does not hold. Then there exists a sequence $\{d_n, \ n \geq 1\} \subset K_{x,\delta_x}$ such that $\min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d_n/|d_n| \rangle \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Since K_{x,δ_x} is compact, by choosing a subsequence if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $d_n \to d \in K_{x,\delta_x}$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, $\min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d/|d| \rangle \geq 0$, which contradicts (68). Thus, (71) holds and, in turn, this implies that there exists $\beta_x > 0$ such that (69) holds.

On the other hand, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}(x)$, since ∂G_i is $\mathcal{C}^1$ near x, it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \inf_{y \in \overline{G}: \ |y-x| \leq \delta} \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), (y-x)/|y-x| \rangle \geq 0.$$

Together with (71) this shows that there exists $R_x \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\inf_{y \in \overline{G}: \ |y-x| \leq R_x (\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} |\gamma^i(x)| + \delta_x)} \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), \frac{y-x}{|y-x|} \rangle > \sup_{d \in K_{x,\delta_x}} \min_{i \in \mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), \frac{d}{|d|} s \rangle. \tag{72}$$

We now use this to prove (70) by contradiction. Suppose that (70) does not hold. Then there exists $d \in \cup_{t \in [0,R_x]} t K_{x,\delta_x}$ such that $d \neq 0$ and $x + d \in \overline{G}$. Since $d \in \cup_{t \in [0,R_x]} t K_{x,\delta_x}$, there is $t^* \leq R_x$ and $d^* \in K_{x,\delta_x}$ such that $d = t^* d^*$ and $|d| \leq R_x(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} |\gamma^i(x)| + \delta_x)$. Then (72) implies that

$$\min_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d^*/|d^*|\rangle = \min_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d/|d|\rangle > \sup_{d\in K_{x,\delta_x}} \min_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} \langle n^i(x), d/|d|\rangle,$$

which contradicts the fact that $d^* \in K_{x,\delta_x}$.

The last statement in the lemma follows directly from the constancy of $n^i(\cdot)$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and the fact that K_{x,δ_x} and δ_x can be chosen to depend on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$ in this case. □

For each $i \in \mathcal{I}(x)$, since ∂G_i is $\mathcal{C}^1$ near $x \in \partial G$, the hyperplane $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \langle n^i(x), y - x\rangle = 0\}$ is the tangent plane to ∂G_i at x for each $i \in \mathcal{I}(x)$. Let

$$S_x \doteq \cap_{i\in\mathcal{I}(x)} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \langle n^i(x), y - x\rangle \geq 0\}. \tag{73}$$

Then $\overline{G}$ can be locally approximated near x by the polyhedral cone S_x in the sense that for each $N > 0$,

$$\{x + (y-x)/r \in \mathbb{R}^J : y \in \overline{G},\ |y - x| \leq Nr\} \to S_x \cap B_N(x) \text{ as } r \to 0, \tag{74}$$

where the convergence is under the Hausdorff distance. In view of (70), it follows that there exist $0 < r_x < \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathcal{V} \cup \cup_{i\notin\mathcal{I}(x)}(\partial G \cap \partial G_i))$ and $\lambda_x \in (0,1)$ such that for each $r \in (0, r_x)$,

$$\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \operatorname{dist}(y, x + \cup_{t\leq R_x} tK_{x,\delta_x}) \leq 3\lambda_x r\right\} \cap \partial G \subset B_r(x) \cap \partial G \tag{75}$$

and

$$\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \operatorname{dist}(y, x + \cup_{t\leq R_x} tK_{x,\delta_x}) \leq 3\lambda_x r\right\} \cap \overline{G} \cap \partial B_r(x) = \emptyset. \tag{76}$$

Let L_{x,δ_x} be a truncated (half) cone with vertex at the origin defined by

$$L_{x,\delta_x} \doteq \cup_{t\leq R_x/2} tK_{x,\delta_x}. \tag{77}$$

Then (70) implies

$$(x + L_{x,\delta_x}) \cap \overline{G} = \{x\}.$$

Proposition A.6. *For each $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$, there exist $0 < r_x < \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathcal{V} \cup \cup_{i\notin\mathcal{I}(x)}(\partial G \cap \partial G_i))$, $A_x \in (0,\infty)$, and a family of nonnegative functions $\{g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G}) : r \in (0, r_x]\}$ that satisfy the following additional properties:*

1. *supp$[g_{x,r}] \cap \overline{G} \subset B_r(x) \cap \overline{G}$;*
2. *$g_{x,r}(y) = 1$ for each $y \in B_{\delta_{x,r}}(x) \cap \overline{G}$ for some constant $\delta_{x,r} > 0$;*
3. *for $r \in (0, r_x)$,*

$$\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |g_{x,r}(y)| \leq A_x, \ \sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\nabla g_{x,r}(y)| \leq \frac{A_x}{r}, \ \sup_{y\in\overline{G}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} \left|\frac{\partial^2 g_{x,r}(y)}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}\right| < \frac{A_x}{r^2};$$

4. *$\langle d, \nabla g_{x,r}(y)\rangle \leq 0$ for all $d \in d(y)$ and $y \in \partial G$.*

Proof. Fix $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$. Let q_x be a unit vector in the set K_x defined in (65) such that $-q_x$ points into G from x, and for each $r \in (0,1)$, define

$$M(x,r) \doteq x - \lambda_x \frac{R_x}{2} r q_x + r L_{x,\delta_x} \tag{78}$$

and

$$M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r) \doteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \operatorname{dist}(y, M(x,r)) \leq 2\lambda_x r\}.$$

Recalling $R_x < 1$, it is easy to see that for each $y \in M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r)$,

$$\operatorname{dist}(y, x + \cup_{t \le R_x} tK_{x,\delta_x}) \le 2\lambda_x r + \left| \lambda_x \frac{R_x}{2} r q_x \right| \le 3\lambda_x r.$$

Thus,

$$M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r) \subseteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \operatorname{dist}(y, x + \cup_{t \le R_x} tK_{x,\delta_x}) \le 3\lambda_x r\}$$

and hence, by (75)–(76) we have

$$M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r) \cap \overline{G} \cap \partial B_r(x) = \emptyset,$$

and

$$M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r) \cap \overline{G} \subset B_r(x) \cap \overline{G}. \tag{79}$$

It follows from Lemma A.3 with $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \cup_{t \ge 0} tK_{x,\delta_x}$, $\mathcal{K} = K_x^{\delta_x/3}$, $\lambda = 2\lambda_x$, $\eta = \eta_x \in (0, \lambda_x)$, $\Lambda = \Lambda_x \doteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \ \eta_x < \operatorname{dist}(y, \cup_{t \ge 0} tK_{x,\delta_x}) \le 2\lambda_x\}$ and $\varepsilon_x = \lambda_x/12 \wedge \eta_x/2$ that there exists a function $\ell_x : \ \Lambda_x \to \mathbb{R}$, that satisfies all the properties stated in Lemma A.3. Let

$$O(x,r) \doteq \overline{G} \cap (M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r) \setminus M^{\eta_x r}(x,r)) \subset B_r(x) \cap \overline{G}. \tag{80}$$

Note that by the local approximation of $\overline{G}$ by S_x at x in (74), by possibly making r_x and λ_x smaller, we may assume that for each $r \in (0, r_x)$ and $y \in O(x,r)$, that is, $y \in \overline{G}$ such that

$$\eta_x < \operatorname{dist}\left(\frac{y-x}{r} + \lambda_x \frac{R_x}{2} q_x, L_{x,\delta_x} \right) \le 2\lambda_x, \tag{81}$$

the projection of $(y-x)/r + \lambda_x (R_x/2) q_x$ to L_{x,δ_x} coincides with the projection of $(y-x)/r + \lambda_x (R_x/2) q_x$ onto $\cup_{t \ge 0} tK_{x,\delta_x}$ since L_{x,δ_x} is the portion of $\cup_{t \ge 0} tK_{x,\delta_x}$ truncated near the vertex. Let $k_{x,r}$ be the function on $O(x,r)$ given by

$$k_{x,r}(y) \doteq \ell_x \left(\frac{y-x}{r} + \lambda_x \frac{R_x}{2} q_x \right), \qquad y \in \mathbb{R}^J. \tag{82}$$

Then the properties of ℓ_x stated in Lemma A.3 and (80) imply that $k_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(O(x,r))$ and $k_{x,r}$ satisfies the following additional properties:

1. there exists $\theta_x > 0$ such that
$$\langle \nabla k_{x,r}(y), p \rangle \le -\theta_x / r \qquad \text{for } p \in K_x^{\delta_x/3} \text{ and } y \in O(x,r);$$
2. for every $i, j \in \{1, \cdots, J\}$,
$$\sup_{y \in O(x,r)} \left| \frac{\partial^2 k_{x,r}(y)}{\partial y_i y_j} \right| < \left(\frac{3}{\eta_x} + 1 \right) \frac{1}{r^2};$$
3. $\sup_{y \in O(x,r)} (|k_{x,r}(y) - \operatorname{dist}((y-x)/r + \lambda_x (R_x/2) q_x, L_{x,\delta_x})| \vee (r|\nabla k_{x,r}(y)| - 1)) \le \lambda_x/12$.

From the first property of $k_{x,r}$ stated above, it follows that

$$\langle r \nabla k_{x,r}(y), \gamma^i(x) \rangle \ge \theta_x \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}(x) \text{ and } y \in O(x,r).$$

Since $\gamma^i(\cdot)$ is continuous for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, by possibly making r_x yet smaller and using the third property of $k_{x,r}$, we may assume that for each $r \in (0, r_x)$,

$$\langle r \nabla k_{x,r}(y), \gamma^i(y) \rangle \ge \theta_x / 2 \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}(y) \text{ and } y \in O(x,r). \tag{83}$$

Now, choose $\zeta_x \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ to be a decreasing function such that

$$\zeta_x(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \in (-\infty, 5\lambda_x/4], \\ \text{strictly decreasing} & \text{if } s \in (5\lambda_x/4, 23\lambda_x/12], \\ 0 & \text{if } s \in (23\lambda_x/12, \infty), \end{cases} \tag{84}$$

and define $g_{x,r}: \mathbb{R}^J \to \mathbb{R}_+$ to be

$$g_{x,r} \doteq \begin{cases} \zeta_x(k_{x,r}(y)) & \text{if } y \in O(x,r), \\ 1 & \text{if } y \in \overline{G} \cap M^{\eta_x r}(x,r), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{85}$$

It follows from the definition of $g_{x,r}$, the properties of ζ_x and $k_{x,r}$, the definitions of $M(x,r)$ and $O(x,r)$ given in (78) and (80), respectively, and property (79) that

$$\begin{aligned} &supp[g_{x,r}] \cap \overline{G} \\ &\quad \subset \left\{ y \in \overline{G}: \ k_{x,r}(y) \le 23\frac{\lambda_x}{12} \right\} \\ &\quad \subset \{ y \in \overline{G}: \ \mathrm{dist}\left(\frac{y-x}{r} + \frac{\lambda_x R_x}{2} q_x, L_{x,\delta_x} \right) \le \frac{23\lambda_x}{12} + \frac{\lambda_x}{12} \} \\ &\quad = \left\{ y \in \overline{G}: \ \mathrm{dist}\left(y - x + \frac{\lambda_x R_x}{2} r q_x, r L_{x,\delta_x} \right) \le 2\lambda_x r \right\} \\ &\quad = M^{2\lambda_x r}(x,r) \cap \overline{G} \\ &\quad \subset B_r(x) \cap \overline{G}. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

This establishes property (1) of the lemma. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{ y \in \overline{G}: \ k_{x,r}(y) \ge 5\lambda_x/4 \} \\ &\quad \subset \left\{ y \in \overline{G}: \ \mathrm{dist}\left(\frac{y-x}{r} + \frac{\lambda_x R_x}{2} q_x, L_{x,\delta_x} \right) \ge \frac{5\lambda_x}{4} - \frac{\lambda_x}{12} \right\} \\ &\quad \subset \left\{ y \in \overline{G}: \ \mathrm{dist}((y-x) + \frac{\lambda_x R_x}{2} r q_x, r L_{x,\delta_x}) \ge \lambda_x r \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Thus, the set on which $g_{x,r}$ is not constant is a strict subset of $O(x,r)$. Combining this with (86) and the properties $\zeta_x \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $k_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(O(x,r))$, it follows that $g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\overline{G})$.

Since x is an interior point of $M(x,r)$, there exists $\delta_{x,r} > 0$ such that $B_{\delta_{x,r}}(x) \subset M(x,r)$. For $y \in B_{\delta_{x,r}}(x)$, property 3 of $k_{x,r}$ implies $k_{x,r}(y) \le \lambda_x/12$, which when combined with (85) and (84), implies $g_{x,r}(y) = 1$. Thus, $g_{x,r}$ satisfies property 2 of the lemma. On the other hand, $g_{x,r}$ satisfies property 3 because of (85) and properties 2 and 3 of $k_{x,r}$. Finally, for each $y \in O(x,r)$, a simple calculation shows that

$$\nabla g_{x,r}(y) = \zeta_x'(k_{x,r}(y)) \nabla k_{x,r}(y).$$

Together with (83) and the fact that ζ_x is non-increasing, this implies that

$$\langle \nabla g_{x,r}(y), \gamma^i(y) \rangle \le 0 \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{I}(y) \text{ and } y \in O(x,r).$$

Thus, $g_{x,r}$ also satisfies the fourth property stated in the lemma. □

Corollary A.7. *If $n^i(\cdot)$ and $\gamma^i(\cdot)$ are constant vector fields for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, then the constants $A_x \in (0,\infty)$ and $r_x > 0$ in Proposition A.6 can be chosen to satisfy $A_x = A_{x'}$ and $r_x = r_{x'}$ if $\mathcal{I}(x) = \mathcal{I}(x')$, $r_x < \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathcal{V} \cup \cup_{i \notin \mathcal{I}(x)} (\partial G \cap \partial G_i))$ and $r_{x'} < \mathrm{dist}(x', \mathcal{V} \cup \cup_{i \notin \mathcal{I}(x')} (\partial G \cap \partial G_i))$. Moreover, the family of nonnegative functions $\{g_{x,r} \in$*

$\mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$: $r \in (0, r_x]\}$ *in Proposition A.6 is translation invariant in the sense that* $g_{x,r}(y) = g_{x+\delta,r}(y+\delta)$ *if* $\mathcal{I}(x) = \mathcal{I}(x')$ *and* $r_x = r_{x'}$.

Proof. Suppose that $n^i(\cdot)$ and $\gamma^i(\cdot)$ are constant vector fields for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Notice that the sets K_x and K_{x,δ_x} and the constant δ_x can be chosen to depend on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$. Similarly, the constants R_x and β_x in Lemma A.5, and hence the set L_{x,δ_x} in (77), depend on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$. It is obvious that $\overline{G} = S_x$ near x and S_x depends on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$. In addition, the constant $\lambda_x \in (0,1)$ in (75) and (76) depends on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$ and r_x in (75) and (76) depends on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$ when $r_x < \text{dist}(x, \mathcal{V} \cup \cup_{i \notin \mathcal{I}(x)} (\partial G \cap \partial G_i))$. Also, notice that by the proof of Lemma 6.2 of [35], the constants $\varepsilon_x \in (0,1)$, $\eta_x > 0$, the set Λ_x and the function ℓ_x depend on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$. By examining the proof of Proposition A.6, we see that the vector q_x, the set $M(x,r)$ in (78), the set $O_{x,r}$ in (80) and the function ζ_x depend on x only through $\mathcal{I}(x)$. This establishes the corollary. □

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Set $r(x,\varepsilon) \doteq ((r_x/2) \wedge \varepsilon) / \max(c_x^2, 1)$ for $x \in \overline{G}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Now, for $x \in G$ and $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$, let $g_x^\varepsilon \doteq g_{x,r(x,\varepsilon)}$ be the corresponding functions in $\mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G})$ constructed in Propositions A.1 and A.6, respectively, and for $x \in \mathcal{V}$, let $g_{x,r(\varepsilon)}$ be as constructed in Proposition A.4. Note that the first property established in Proposition A.1 shows that when $x \in G$, $g_x^\varepsilon(y) = 0$ for $y \in \partial G$. Together with the finiteness of $\mathcal{V}$, the second property of Proposition A.4, the definition of r_x for $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$, and the first property of Proposition A.6, this shows that g_x^ε is constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$. On the other hand, when combined with the first property of Proposition A.1 and the fourth properties of Propositions A.4 and A.6, it shows that $\langle d, \nabla g_x^\varepsilon(y) \rangle \leq 0$ for $d \in d(y)$ and $y \in \partial G$. Thus, $g_x^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{H}$. In addition, the choice of $r(\varepsilon)$ and the first two properties of $\{g_{x,r(\varepsilon)}, x \in \overline{G}\}$ established in Propositions A.1, A.4 and A.6 immediately imply that $\{g_x^\varepsilon, x \in \overline{G}\}$ satisfies the first two properties stated in Proposition 6.1. The second part of the proposition follows directly from Remark A.2 and Corollary A.7. □

Appendix B. Verification of Assumption 1 for Example 4.5.

In this section we show that Assumption 1 holds for the two-dimensional domain G with a cusp at the origin described in Example 4.5. The argument relies on the construction of a family of functions $\{g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) : r \in (0, r_x), x \in \overline{G}\}$ that is similar to the family constructed in Appendix A. Once again, the nature of the construction is different, depending on whether $x \in G$, $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$ or $x \in \mathcal{V}$. For $x \in G$, let $\{g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) : r \in (0, r_x)\}$ be the family of functions constructed in Proposition A.1. Now, clearly $(G, d(\cdot))$ is piecewise $\mathcal{C}^1$ with continuous reflection and, as discussed in Example 4.5, Assumption 2' is satisfied with $\mathcal{V} = \{0\}$. Therefore, there exists a family of functions $\{g_{0,r}, r \in (0, r_0/c_0^2)\}$ that satisfy the properties stated in Proposition A.4.

It remains to consider $x \in \partial G \setminus \mathcal{V}$. We first consider the case $x \in \partial G_1 \setminus \{0\}$. As x moves to the right along ∂G_1 to infinity, the curvature of ∂G_1 tends to 0. In other words, the larger $|x|$ is, the flatter ∂G_1 is in any neighbourhood of $x \in \partial G^1$. The angle between $n^1(x)$ and $\gamma^1(x)$ is fixed and is equal to $\theta_1 \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. Let $K_x \doteq \{-\gamma^1(x)\}$. Then $|\gamma^1(x)| = 1/\cos(\theta_1)$ because $\langle n^1(x), \gamma^1(x) \rangle = 1$. By the geometry of ∂G_1 and Lemma A.5, there exist $\delta > 0$, $R \in (0,1)$ and $\beta > 0$ (all depending only on ∂G^1 and θ_1) such that with $K_{x,\delta} \doteq B_\delta(-\gamma^1(x))$, (69) and (70) hold with δ_x and β_x replaced by δ and β, respectively. Under the local coordinates at x (i.e., taking the tangent line to

∂G_1 as the x-axis and $-n^1(x)$ as the y-axis), the set $x + \cup_{t \leq R} tK_{x,\delta}$ is identical for each $x \in \partial G_1 \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, it follows that there exist $\bar{r} \in (0,1)$ and $\lambda \in (0,1)$ (both depending only on ∂G^1 and θ_1) such that for each $r \in (0, \bar{r})$, (75) and (76) hold with δ_x, R_x and λ_x replaced by δ, R and λ, respectively. Let $L_{x,\delta}$ be a truncated (half) cone with vertex at the origin defined by

$$L_{x,\delta} \doteq \cup_{t \leq R/2} tK_{x,\delta}.$$

Thus, $(x + L_{x,\delta}) \cap \overline{G} = \{x\}$ and $L_{x,\delta}$ is identical under the local coordinates at x for each $x \in \partial G_1 \setminus \{0\}$. For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $0 < \eta < 2\lambda < \infty$, it follows from Lemma A.3 with $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \cup_{t \geq 0} tK_{x,\delta}$, $\mathcal{K} = B_{\delta/3}(-\gamma^1(x))$ and $\Lambda = \Lambda_x \doteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^J : \eta < \operatorname{dist}(y, \cup_{t \geq 0} tK_{x,\delta}) \leq 2\lambda\}$ that there exists a function $\ell_x : \Lambda_x \to \mathbb{R}$, that satisfies all the properties stated in Lemma A.3. Notice that ℓ_x and Λ_x are identical under the local coordinates at x for each $x \in \partial G_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and by (69), θ in property (3) of ℓ_x depends only on ∂G^1 and θ_1. Then, using an argument similar to that used in the proof of Proposition A.6, there exist $0 < r_x < \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial G_2)$ and $A \in (0, \infty)$ and a family of functions $\{g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) : r \in (0, r_x]\}$ satisfying all the properties in Proposition A.6. Here, for each $x_1, x_2 \in \partial G_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $r < r_{x_1} \wedge r_{x_2}$, $g_{x_1,r}$ and $g_{x_2,r}$ are identical under the local coordinates at x_1 and x_2, respectively. By symmetry, a family of functions $\{g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) : r \in (0, r_x],\ x \in \partial G_2 \setminus \{0\}\}$ that satisfy analogous properties can also be established. Using the family of functions $\{g_{x,r} \in \mathcal{C}_c^2(\overline{G}) : r \in (0, r_x],\ x \in \overline{G}\}$, we can follow a similar argument as the one in the proof of Theorem 2 for the case when $(G, d(\cdot))$ is a polyhedral domain with piecewise constant reflection to establish Assumption 1.

Appendix C. Proof of Lemma 5.1

Let

$$\xi(\lambda) \doteq \int_{\overline{G}} \left[\psi(f_1(y) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y) - \lambda \mathcal{L} f_1(y)) - \psi(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y))\right] d\pi(y).$$

Since ψ is concave, it is clear that the map $\lambda \mapsto \xi(\lambda)$ is also concave. To prove the lemma, we need to show that $\xi(\lambda) \leq 0$. In turn, to establish this, it suffices to show that $\xi'(0) \leq 0$ because ξ is concave and $\xi(0) = 0$.

Now, $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G})$ and for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$ implies $f_i \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G})$. Thus, the function $\Psi(\cdot) \doteq \psi(f_1(\cdot), \cdots, f_n(\cdot))$ lies in $\mathcal{C}_b^2(\overline{G})$. In addition, since ψ is monotone increasing in each variable separately, and $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, it follows that for each $y \in \partial G$ and $d \in d(y)$,

$$\langle d, \nabla \Psi(y) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\langle d, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z_i}(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)) \nabla f_i(y) \right\rangle \leq 0.$$

Moreover, since $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$ implies f_i is constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$, it follows that Ψ is also constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$. Since $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$ also implies that f_i is constant outside some compact set, it follows that Ψ is also constant outside some compact set. These show that $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and therefore, by (2), that

$$\int_{\overline{G}} \mathcal{L}\Psi(y) d\pi(y) \geq 0.$$

Now,

$$\xi'(0) = -\int_{\overline{G}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z_i} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \mathcal{L} f_i(y) \right) d\pi(y).$$

Thus, if we can show that for each $y \in G$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z_i} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \mathcal{L} f_i(y) \geq \mathcal{L}\Psi(y), \tag{88}$$

it follows that $\xi'(0) \leq 0$. In the rest of the proof, we establish (88).

Fix $y \in G$. A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}\Psi(y) &= \sum_{i=1}^{J} b_i(y) \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z_k} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \left(\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_j}(y) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z_k} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(y) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z_i} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \mathcal{L} f_i(y) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \left(\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_j}(y) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, to establish (88) it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \left(\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} \left(f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)\right) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_j}(y) \right) \leq 0.$$

Since the matrix $a(y)$ is positive semidefinite, let $a^{1/2}(y)$ be its positive semidefinite square root. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_j}(y) &= (\nabla f_k(y))^T a(y) \nabla f_l(y) \\
&= \left(a^{1/2}(y) \nabla f_k(y)\right)^T \left(a^{1/2}(y) \nabla f_l(y)\right) \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{J} c_m^k c_m^l,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c^k = a^{1/2}(y)\nabla f_k(y)$ for each $k = 1, \cdots, n$. Now, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \left(\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} (f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_j}(y) \right) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} (f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)) \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial x_i}(y) \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial x_j}(y) \right) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} (f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y)) \sum_{m=1}^{J} c_m^k c_m^l \\
&\qquad = \sum_{m=1}^{J} \left(\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z_k \partial z_l} (f_1(y), \cdots, f_n(y))\, c_m^k c_m^l \right) \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because the Hessian matrix of ψ is negative semidefinite since ψ is concave. □

Appendix D. Proof of Lemma 5.13

Fix $x \in \mathcal{V}$. By Assumption 2 there exist positive constants $r_x,\ c_x, \alpha_x$ that satisfy $h(y) \geq c_x|y-x|$, $\langle v_x, a(y)v_x\rangle \geq \alpha_x$ and $\langle v_x, d\rangle \geq 0$ for all $d \in d(y)$ and all $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)$. Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, r_x)$ be such that ε_0 is less than the distance between any two points in $\mathcal{V}$. For each $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ such that $2(\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) < c_x\varepsilon_0$ and $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ sufficiently small such that $\delta + \sqrt{\delta} < \varepsilon$, let $l_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ be a function such that

$$l_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \leq \delta, \\ \frac{2\sqrt{\delta}+1}{3\sqrt{\delta}}(s-\delta)^3 & \text{if } \delta < s \leq \delta + \sqrt{\delta}, \\ 2\delta(\sqrt{\delta}+1) + s^2 - (\delta+\sqrt{\delta})^2 & \text{if } \delta + \sqrt{\delta} < s \leq \varepsilon, \\ \begin{array}{c} 2\delta(\sqrt{\delta}+1) - (\delta+\sqrt{\delta})^2 + \varepsilon^2 \\ +\varepsilon^{3/2} - \sqrt{\varepsilon}(s-\varepsilon-\sqrt{\varepsilon})^2 \end{array} & \text{if } \varepsilon < s \leq \varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \\ 2\delta(\sqrt{\delta}+1) - (\delta+\sqrt{\delta})^2 + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^{3/2} & \text{if } \varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon} < s. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq l_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) \leq 5\varepsilon,\ 0 \leq l'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}, && \text{for } s \in \mathbb{R}, \\ &l'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) = 0, && \text{for } s > \varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Also, note that $l_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R})$ is piecewise differentiable with derivative

$$l''_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } s \leq \delta, \\ \frac{4\sqrt{\delta}+2}{\sqrt{\delta}}(s-\delta) & \text{if } \delta \leq s < \delta + \sqrt{\delta}, \\ 2 & \text{if } \delta + \sqrt{\delta} < s < \varepsilon, \\ -2\sqrt{\varepsilon} & \text{if } \varepsilon < s < \varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon} < s. \end{cases}$$

We now use a standard mollifcation argument to construct a $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$ function with similar properties. Let $\{\phi_n \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a sequence of non-negative functions with $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_n(x)\,dx = 1$ and compact supports that shrink to $\{0\}$. Define

$$l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon} \doteq \phi_n * l_{\delta,\varepsilon},$$

where $*$ denotes the convolution operation. Then $l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ and for n sufficiently large, there exist $\kappa_n > 0$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \kappa_n = 0$ such that

$$\begin{array}{lll} & (l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon})''(s) \geq 2 & \text{if } \delta + 2\sqrt{\delta} \leq s \leq \varepsilon/2, \\ & |(l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon})''(s)| \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} & \text{if } s \geq \varepsilon - \kappa_n \\ (90) & (l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon})''(s) = 0 & \text{if } s \geq 2(\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \\ & l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) = 2\delta(\sqrt{\delta}+1) - (\delta+\sqrt{\delta})^2 + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^{3/2} & \text{if } s \geq 2(\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \\ & (l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon})''(s) \geq 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{array}$$

Now, choose n sufficiently large and let

$$g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y) \doteq \begin{cases} l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon}(h(y)), & \text{if } y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x) \\ 2\delta(\sqrt{\delta}+1) - (\delta+\sqrt{\delta})^2 + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^{3/2}, & \text{if } y \in \overline{G} \setminus B_{r_x}(x). \end{cases}$$

We now show that $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ has the desired properties. Firstly, since $l_{\delta,\varepsilon}(s) = 0$ when $s \leq \delta$, it follows that $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is zero in a neighborhood of x. In addition, the second property in (89), the fact that $\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon} < c_x\varepsilon_0$ and $h(y) \geq c_x|y-x|$ imply that $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is constant when $y \in \overline{G} \setminus B_{\varepsilon_0}(x)$. By the choice of ε_0, this implies that $g_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is constant in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{V}$. Also, by the nonnegativity of ϕ_n and $l_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ as well as the property of v_x stated in Assumption 2, it follows that for every $y \in \partial G$,

$$\langle \nabla g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y), d\rangle = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} l'_{\delta,\varepsilon}(h(y)-z)\phi_n(z)dz\right)\langle v_x, d\rangle \geq 0, \qquad d \in d(y).$$

Thus, $g_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}^2_c(\overline{G}) \oplus \mathbb{R}$ and $-g_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{H}$. In addition, the first property in (89) shows that $\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)| \leq 5\varepsilon$ and $\sup_{y\in\overline{G}} |\nabla g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)| \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}$, while the second property in (89) implies that

$$|\langle b(y), \nabla g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)\rangle| \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \sup_{|y-x|\leq 2\varepsilon_0} |b(y)|, \qquad y \in \overline{G}.$$

Next, note that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^J a_{ij}(y)\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = (l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon})''(h(y))v_x^T a(y)v_x.$$

The first property in (90) and the definition of α_x implies that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^J a_{ij}(y)\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \geq 2\alpha_x, \qquad \text{if } \delta + 2\sqrt{\delta} \leq h(y) \leq \varepsilon/2, y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x).$$

Moreover, by the second and third properties in (90), and the fact that $\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon} < c_x\varepsilon_0$ it is clear that for each $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)$ with $h(y) \geq \varepsilon - \kappa_n$,

$$\left|\sum_{i,j=1}^J a_{ij}(y)\frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}\right| \leq \left|(l^n_{\delta,\varepsilon})''(h(y))\right| |a(y)| \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \sup_{|y-x|\leq 2\varepsilon_0} |a(y)|.$$

The fourth property in (90) shows that when $y \in \overline{G} \cap B_{r_x}(x)$ with $h(y) < \delta + 2\sqrt{\delta}$ or $\varepsilon/2 < h(y) < \varepsilon - \kappa_n$,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{J} a_{ij}(y) \frac{\partial^2 g_{\delta,\varepsilon}(y)}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \geq 0.$$

Thus, we have shown that that properties 1–6 hold with $c = 2\min_{x\in\mathcal{V}} \alpha_x$ and

$$C = 5 \vee 2 \sup_{|y-x|\leq 2\varepsilon_0} (|a(y)| \vee |b(y)|) < \infty.$$

References

[1] Atar, R., Budhiraja, A. and Dupuis, P. (2001). On positive recurrence of constrained diffusion processes. *The Annals of Probability.* 29 No. 2, 979-1000.

[2] Barlow, M. T. and Yor, M. (1982) Semimartingale inequalities via the Garsia-Rodemich-Rumsey lemma, and applications to local times. *Journal of Functional Analysis.* 49 No. 2, 198-229.

[3] Bass, R.F. and Lavrentiev, A. (2007) The submartingale problem for a class of degenerate elliptic operators, *Probability Theory and Related Fields.* 139 415-449.

[4] Bramson, M. (2011) A positive recurrent reflecting Brownian motion with divergent fluid path. *Annals of Applied Probability.* 21, 3:951-986.

[5] Bouchard, B. (2008) Optimal reflection of diffusions and barrier options pricing under constraints, (slides). *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization.* 47 4:1785-1813.

[6] Dahlberg, B. E. J. (1977). Estimates of harmonic measure. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **65** 275-288.

[7] Dieker, A.B. and Moriarty, J. Reflected Brownian motion in a wedge: sum-of-exponential stationary densities. *Electronic Communications in Probability,* 14 1-16.

[8] DeBlassie, R. D. and Toby, E. H. (1993). Reflected Brownian motion in a cusp. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **339** 297321.

[9] DeBlassie, R. D. and Toby, E. H. (1993). On the semimartingale representation of reflected Brownian motion in a cusp. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **94** 505-524.

[10] Dai, J. G. and Harrison, J.M. (1992). Reflected Brownian motion in an orthant: numerical methods for steady-state analysis, *Annals of Applied Probability* 2 65-86.

[11] Dai, J.G. and Kurtz, T. G. (1994) Characterization of the stationary distribution of a semimartingale reflected Brownian motion in a convex polyhedron. *Preprint.*

[12] Dupuis, P. and Ishii, H. (1993). SDEs with oblique reflections on nonsmooth domains. *The Annals of Probability* **21** 554-580. Correctional note: (2008). **36** 1992-1997.

[13] Dupuis, P. and Ramanan, K. (1998). A Skorokhod problem formulation and large deviation analysis of a processor sharing model. *Queueing Systems.* 28 109-124.

[14] Dupuis, P. and Ramanan, K. (1999). Convex duality and Skorokhod problem - I. *Probability Theory and Related Fields.* **115** 153-195.

[15] Dupuis, P. and Ramanan, K. (1999). Convex duality and Skorokhod problem - II. *Probability Theory and Related Fields.* **115** 197-236.

[16] Dupuis, P. and Ramanan, K. (2000). A multiclass feedback queueing network with a regular Skorokhod problem. *Queueing Systems.* **36** 327–349.

[17] Echeverria, P. (1982). A criterion for invariant measures of Markov processes, *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **61** 1C16.

[18] M. Freidlin. *Functional Integration and Partial Differential Equations.* Annals of Mathematics Studies Vol. 109, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985.

[19] Friedman, A. (1964). *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type.* Prentice-Hall, Inc, New Jersey.

[20] Friedman, A. (1975). *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications.* Volume 1. Academic Press, New York.

[21] Burdzy, K., Kang, W.N. and Ramanan, K. (2008) The Skorokhod problem in a time-dependent interval. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 119, 428–452.

[22] Harrison, M.J., Landau, H. J. and Shepp, L. A. The stationary distribution of reflected Brownian motion in a planar region. *The Annals of Probability.* 13 No. 3, 744–757.

[23] Harrison, J. M., Williams, R. J. and Chen, H. (1990) Bronwian models of closed queueing networks with homogeneous customer populations. *Stochastics.* **29**, 37–74 (1990).

[24] Harrison, J. M. and Williams, R. J. (1987) Multidimensional reflected Brownian motions having exponential stationary distributions. *The Annals of Probability.* 15 No. 1, 115-137.

[25] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve, *Brownian motion and Stochastic Calculus.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.

[26] Jacod, J and Shiryaev, A. N. (1987). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

[27] (2009) Kang, W. N., Kelly, F. P., Lee, N. H. and Williams, R. J. State space collapse and diffusion approximation for a network operating under a fair bandwidth-sharing policy. *Annals of Applied Probability* 19, 1719-1780.

[28] Kang, W. N. and Ramanan, K. (2010) A Dirichlet process characterization of a class of reflected diffusions. *Annals of Probability* **38**, 1062-1105.

[29] Kang, W. N. and Ramanan, K. (2012) On the submartingale problem for reflected diffusions in piecewise smooth domains. *Working Paper.*

[30] Kang, W. N. and Williams, R. J. (2006). An invariance principle for semimartingale reflecting Brownian motions in domains with piecewise smooth boundaries. *The Annals of Probability.* 17 No. 2, 741-779.

[31] Knessl, C. and Morrison, J. A. (2003) Heavy traffic analysis of two coupled processors. *Queueing Systems* 43 173–220.

[32] Kwon, Y. (1992). The submartingale problem for Brownian motion in a cone with nonconstant oblique reflection. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **92**, 351391.

[33] Kwon, Y. and Williams, R.J. (1991). Reflecting Brownian motion in a cone with radially homogeneous reflection field. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **327**, 739780.

[34] Newell, G. F. (1979). Approximate behavior of tandem queues. *Lecture notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems.* Vol. 171 Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[35] Ramanan, K. (2006). Reflected diffusions defined via the extended Skorokhod map. *Electronic Journal of Probability.* Vol. 11 934-992.

[36] Ramanan, K. and Reed, J. Queues in series with firm global deadline times. *Preprint.*

[37] Ramanan, K. and Reiman, M. I. (2003). Fluid and heavy traffic limits for a generalized processor sharing model. *Annals of Applied Probability.* Vol. 13 100-139.

[38] Ramanan, K. and Reiman, M. I. (2008) The heavy traffic limit of an unbalanced generalized processor sharing model. *Annals of Applied Probability.* Vol. 18 22-58.

[39] Ramasubramanian, S. (2000) A subsidy-surplus model and the Skorokhod problem in the orthant. *Mathematics of Operations Research* Vol. 25 3:509–538.

[40] Reiman, M. I. and Williams, R. J. (1988) A boundary property of semimartingale reflecting Brownian motions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields.* 77 87-97. Correctional note. (1989) *Probability Theory and Related Fields.* 80 633.

[41] Revuz, D. and Yor, M. (1999). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion.* Third Edition. Springer, New York.

[42] Saure, D., Glynn, P. and Zeevi, A. A linear programming algorithm for computing the stationary distribution of semi-martingale reflected Brownian motion. *Working paper.*

[43] Schwerer, E. and Van Mieghem, J. (1994). Brownian models of closed queueing networks: explicit solutions for balanced three-station systems. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 4, 448-477.

[44] A.V. Skorokhod. Stochastic equations for diffusions in a bounded region, *Theor. of Prob. and Appl.*, **6** (1961) 264–274.

[45] Stroock, D.W. and Varadhan, S.R.S. (1971). Diffusion processes with boundary conditions. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **24**, 147-225.

[46] Stroock, D. W. and Varadhan, S.R.S. (2006). *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes.* Springer, New York.

[47] Taylor, L. M. and Williams, R. J. (1993). Existence and uniqueness of semimartingale reflecting Brownian motions in an orthant. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **96** 283-317.

[48] Varadhan, S.R.S. and Williams, R. J. (1985). Brownian motion in a wedge with oblique reflection. *Communications in Pure and Applied Mathematics* **38** 405-443.

[49] Weiss, A. (1981). Invariant measures of diffusion processes on domains with boundaries, Ph.D. dissertation, New York University.

[50] Williams, R. J. (1985) Reflected Brownian motion in a wedge: semimartingale property *Z. Wahr. verw. Geb.* 69 161-176.

[51] Williams, R. J. (1985) Recurrence classification and invariant measure for reflected Brownian motion in a wedge. *Annals of Probability.* 13 758-778.

[52] Williams, R. J. (1987) Reflected Brownian motion with skew symmetric data in a polyhedral domain. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 75 459-485.

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 1000 Hilltop Circle, Baltimore, MD 21250
E-mail address: `wkang@umbc.edu`

Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, RI 02118, USA
E-mail address: `kramanan@math.cmu.edu`